# A WASHINGTON BIBLE CLASS

GAIL HAMILTON

7.1.'02

From the Library of

Professor William Henry Green

Bequeathed by him to

the Library of

Princeton Theological Seminary

BR 125 .H35 1891
Hamilton, Gail, 1833-1896.
A Washington Bible class

# A WASHINGTON BIBLE-CLASS

BY
GAIL HAMILTON

NEW YORK
D. APPLETON AND COMPANY
1891

Copyright, 1890,
By D. APPLETON AND COMPANY.

# CONTENTS.


| CHAPTER | | PAGE |
|---|---|---|
| | Introduction | 1 |
| I. | A Preliminary Skirmish | 8 |
| II. | The Real Genesis | 25 |
| III. | The King of Salem | 64 |
| IV. | The Institutes of Moses | 79 |
| V. | The Origin of Sacrifice | 94 |
| VI. | The New Testament Solvent of the Old Testament Sacrifices | 122 |
| VII. | The Election of Paul and the Election of Presbytery | 148 |
| VIII. | Spiritual Heat considered as a Mode of Motion | 173 |
| IX. | The Sectarian Argument | 209 |
| X. | Inspiration | 230 |
| XI. | Oneness with Christ | 270 |
| XII. | Miracles | 283 |

# A WASHINGTON BIBLE CLASS.

## INTRODUCTION.

THEOLOGY, always an interesting theme, is never more interesting than in an intellectual center like Washington. As the basis, the interpretation, and the inspiration of politics, theology is surveyed with a keener scrutiny than in the more tranquil, the less strenuous spheres of life. In an atmosphere of debate, theoretical errors are promptly detected; and men who are wont to reply, listen to the argument of the pulpit with an alertness born of the habit of replying, though they listen perforce in silence.

A mother in Washington, high in the ranks of politics, fashion, and all the arts and graces of life, a mother of growing sons, took counsel with other mothers like-minded, as to what should be the religious teaching of her boys.

Their clever, alert young minds absolutely rejected sundry received doctrines; nor could she enforce statements which her own reason could buttress only with authority. A mother of growing daughters, a lissome, gladsome, winsome group, unburdened her soul of similar perplexities concerning their uprearing. Two young girls, one just bounding into the gay, bright, fascinating world of belledom, the other just looking out of it with

happy, questioning eyes into a deeper and dearer world, found in their beautiful, dutiful days, time and space and thought for the most solemn problems of life, and were forever seeking the eternal light. A perfect woman, nobly planned, superb in her splendid prime, tranquil in conscious power, moving on with no more sign of disturbance or revolt than the shining moon curving through cloudless skies, lifted by chance one day the curtain of her thought and revealed a mind utterly at variance with the tenets of the church whose service she attended and whose creed in its institutions she upheld. Another, rich in every gift that love and nature can lavish, never wearied of blessing the world with sympathy, succor, and the cheer of her gracious presence; but for all spiritual consolation toward herself could only say, with sweet but final accent, "When I was in sore need, religion did not help me"; yet in every word and deed tested the truth of Christ, "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these, my brethren, ye have done it unto me." On all sides the unquenchable thirst for God, the free action of thought, were battling with ecclesiasticism, and would not be put off with authority or put off from religion.

Then up spake a woman to whom theology is the breath of life: "Let us leave speculation to itself; let us cease to question error, and let us search for truth. The Bible is the source of our formulated faith. Whether it is authority or not, nothing else is authoritative. Let us see, not what is Calvinism, or Lutherism, or Agnosticism, or Catholicism, or Universalism, but what is Scripture; not what men say Scripture says and means, but what Scripture itself means and says."

Thus the Lord gave the word to the Bible class. The women, prepared to publish the tidings, were a great host. The wife of the President, with highest interest in

highest things, was foremost in support. The wife of the Secretary of State, ever hospitable to truth, proffered her drawing-room for the study of the Holy Scriptures. But before the class had formed itself for its first gathering, a fleecy, filmy cloud, that had boded no evil in a sunny sky, suddenly deepened and darkened with the thunderbolts of God. From the home which would have welcomed the Bible class, from a home which had held four and thirty years of unbroken family unity, a son of rare promise, a daughter of tender love,

> "Went pressing, almost hand in hand,
> Too early to the unknown land,"

and all the world was changed.

Sad days lengthened into sad weeks of heartache that can cease only with heart-beat, the pain of an absence that only presence can heal. With the ever-watchful tact of sympathy, the wife of the Vice-President began to revive the idea of the Bible class, and to insure it by fixing its early date. The wife of the President promptly renewed her fealty, and remained a constant, suggestive, enthusiastic student, commanding her children and her household after her, not only in stimulating attendance and attention, but in an always generous consideration. Both houses of Congress, the circles of science, of literature, of education, of diplomacy, sent their delegates. Presbyterianism, Congregationalism, Unitarianism, Episcopacy, were ably and amiably represented, and never more agreeably than when, in Horatian phrase, beautiful daughters came with their more beautiful mothers. The English Church and the Greek Church bent to each other with stately courtesy. The Quaker faith was there, robed according to the last dainty imported touch of the children of this world, but with all the gentle aspect and saintly bearing of George Fox and the Whittiers, brother and sister. Ignatius Loyola and Jonathan Edwards sat

side by side in French costume of faultless cut and wonderful combination; and the one had danced no more lightly or deeply into Saturday night than the other. Young Radicalism found the texts for old Orthodoxy; and both smiled approval whenever the sword of the Spirit slipped in between the loosened joints of Error's gaping armor. All came together, not to advocate any theory or repel any doctrine whatever, but to learn for themselves what the Bible teaches.

From the beginning there was not wanting a man to stand before the Lord; but in the beginning he stood alone. Just one man was present at the first assembling, protecting and protected by his serene and lovely, but resolute, young, keen-minded Presbyterian wife, and bore himself so heroically amid the somewhat formidable feminine host that one man more, a senator of the United States, nerved himself to walk in erect and smiling, as if brave, *after the lesson was over,* and patronizingly comment, as he advanced, "I hear you have demolished the Serpent and the Garden of Eden at the first bout. What is the next objective point?" But he never smiled again! As time went on, men crept in singly and in pairs, till, numbers lending courage, Cabinet, clergy, press, diplomacy, science, literature, "magnetism," came to be represented, not by their women only, but by men. So mightily grew the word of God, and prevailed.

In the outset the idea of the Bible class was one of common study, comparison of results, and general conference, on a basis of equal and entire ignorance. But the woman who had first suggested the mode of study, and who by parliamentary courtesy was placed in the chair as leader, speedily abused the position. The novelty of being able to speak her mind bore down every instinct of justice, till she completely monopolized the talk, and, instead of seeking the views of others, spent the

whole time in expounding her own. The natural grace and modesty of her audience lent itself to this remorseless usurpation. The rights of woman were ruthlessly sacrificed, freedom of speech was gradually abolished, and intellectual despotism, routed from our political institutions, found its final refuge and firm establishment in this lay and female chair of theology in the capital of our great republic. No man was allowed so much as to enter the room until he had by contract forfeited his right of discussion and promised to listen in silence, if not subjection. Fear of each other was sufficient to hold the women in check, for they dreaded nothing so much as to be called on to give an opinion. The woman in the chair was, like all tyrants, the most terrified of the whole throng, and behind this autocracy, untempered by assassination, strove only to conceal her desperate fear of being questioned, and thus thrown off a track which she needed all the courage at her command to hold. A steaming *samovar* immediately following the Bible talk was the signal for universal emancipation. The men were by that time so thoroughly subjugated that they seldom had spirit left for any expression but of accord, or at least acquiescence. But the women were simply braced for battle, and clustered round the chairwoman with great heartsomeness—some to dispute her positions, others to carry the fight further, and win even more advanced positions. And, strange to say, the eldest mothers in Israel, the gentle, sweet-faced, white-haired grandmothers, pressed furthest to the front. No doubt was left of the intense interest in theology. The silence of the audience during the talk, and the melodious but multifarious cadences of the audience after the talk, were equally an inspiration.

In the beginning, one hour was announced as the duration of the exercise, but at the end of the first hour the audience met a movement of dismissal with rebellion.

They filibustered after the straightforward fashion of women. They said: "It is only half past four, and we will not go." Then they sat still. They refused to move. They confronted the cowardly chairwoman with a steady, defiant gaze, till she was fain to take refuge in talking on. She had her revenge by keeping no bounds in subsequent meetings. She ostentatiously placed an open watch on the table at the outset, and never consulted it. She begs to announce modestly to her brother clergymen that *her* only difficulty was to induce her congregation to disperse when the sermon was over; that she had to buy them off with the tea and cakes of the Secretary of State; and that, without any extraneous assistance of diversion from music, or litany, or liturgy, or even passing round the contribution-box, her congregation sat for an hour and a half of solid sermon, and seemed always surprised, not to say indignant, that that was all.

So profound is human interest in the quest of religious truth!

When the sun lighted upon Washington with fervent heat, the wise chairwoman determined to bring the Bible class to a close while yet their ardor seemed unabated, and the keenness of their search for truth not dulled by infelicity in its conduct. Before, however, the Bible class went its summer ways to the ends of the earth, its members made a united and formal request for the manuscript notes:

"We have followed with deep interest during the past winter the results of your studies and meditations on several subjects bearing upon the spiritual welfare of humanity. We have continually felt a desire to examine more carefully the views that you placed so forcibly and so rapidly before us, and to possess them in the form of a more permanent record. In order to satisfy this desire,

and to enable us to share with our friends who could not be present the pleasure and instruction that you have afforded us, may we now beg of you a copy of your manuscript notes that we may have them printed ?"

The chairwoman pleads no false modesty. Constantly and unconsciously forming theological views, she finds nothing so satisfactory as sharing them with the whole world, and thus gathering to her own the illumination of other minds. The Sundays which she spent with her Bible class she has no hesitation in saying were the happiest and most inspiring Sundays of her life. The Bible class but asked her to do what only a sense of propriety prevented her from clamoring for opportunity to do. The Bible talks were prepared with the keenest interest and enjoyment. With equal interest and enjoyment, and with the added stimulus of personal gratification, as many notes as can be crowded into the compass of this book are prepared for publication.

It is, perhaps, needless to say that the class are not responsible for the theology. It will be observed that their letter is written with discrimination. It affirms not assent, but "interest." It desires not to indorse, but to "examine."

In compliance with this request, and with the grateful consent, concurrence, and co-operation of the chairwoman, I have arranged these Bible talks in as condensed and shapely form as may be, and with the heartiest right hand of fellowship they are hereby presented

To the Bible class.

GAIL HAMILTON.

## CHAPTER I.

### A PRELIMINARY SKIRMISH.

*The first exercise of the Bible class was conversational. I have, therefore, put the first chapter in conversational form, though no attempt is made at a report of the conversation; nor is the succession of topics strictly followed. Some of the themes treated in this chapter were discussed at a later period; but logically and theologically they belong with the other points in the first chapter.*

NORFOLK. How much of a Bible do you think the higher criticism would leave us if it should be allowed to have its own way?

MONSON. Every word, letter, iota of a Bible that would be as much of a Thesaurus to the philosopher as it is to the saint.

NORFOLK. That is decisive, to say the least.

MONSON. Are you surprised?

NORFOLK. Rather! You have been so occupied with other matters, I assumed, or presumed, you had stayed where you belonged.

MONSON. That is, you thought I was clamped so hard into the wooden, plenary, mechanical theory that I could not stir.

NORFOLK. Say, rather, I thought you were so rooted and grounded in the good old orthodox faith that you would resist these wild German cyclones, not to speak of the milder English imitations.

MONSON. And you thought right. Tell me, now,

how much of a Bible do you think would be left us if we were to shut down on the higher criticism ?

NORFOLK. All that has existed for eighteen hundred years, and I am weak enough to think that is a good deal of a Bible and a pretty good sort of one, too—good enough for me.

MONSON. You would say, then, that all the study, and all the learning, and all the devotion that have been brought to bear on the Bible for centuries, and which one might call a perpetual miracle, goes for nothing. We know no more about the Bible than if it had never been studied.

NORFOLK. On the contrary. But the Bible is unchanged. We know more about it; but its volume, its authority, are the same.

MONSON. Then there is no difference between us. We are on precisely the same ground.

NORFOLK. Not quite. That is, if you give loose rein to the higher criticism ; because that, in effect, reduces the Bible to nothing. What with its mathematical and historical errors, its tripping up of the Pentateuch, and its general shuffling of the authors, its post-exilic Exodus and its post-Davidic Deuteronomy, its allegoric history and its fabulous miracle, you have practically exchanged your Bible for a Mother Goose's Melodies. I believe scholars have not been wanting to argue learnedly that great national policies have been wrapped up in Jack and Gill and Old King Cole.

MONSON. I admit I do not go into those things very extensively. When you hit me with Reuss and Graf, and Strauss and Keim, Harnack, Hausrath, Kneuen and Baur, Volkmar and Wellhauser and Ewald, I am bowled over quick. I do not object to their methods or their results ; only I do not know them except in a general way. It is your business to know ; but it is my privilege to

browse where I like. I am supported in my ignorance of their work by seeing how impossible it seems for you professionals to agree as to what they teach. The higher critics and the lower critics quote the same authorities to support their own positions. Huxley and the principal of King's College pull hairs as fiercely over Holtzmann as they do over the Gadarene pigs, against which Saint Thomas seems to have a special spite.

NORFOLK. Then pray tell me how you can set so high a value on such criticism.

MONSON. Truth generally has to be struck out by hard blows, and then often only in sparks. It is not so much the value to the world of any one man's deposit; but it is of value that every man should be free to strike for the truth in his own way.

NORFOLK. Even if, in so doing, he strikes the truth away?

MONSON. Beyond question; because truth held under duress is no truth at all—is only a dead weight. But really, when you get down to it, I am egoist enough to admit that what I really go by is my own criticism, not German or English.

NORFOLK. Beg pardon! Then I am addressing Higher Criticism itself.

MONSON. Now, do not be satirical, if only for the sake of old times. I have had a fairly busy life, and I am no *scholar*. I really feel my limitations so keenly that you must not laugh at me. But I was brought up on the Bible, and I took to it as naturally as a duck to water. Then I was brought up, and I remain, a Congregationalist, and there is nothing to Congregationalism if it is not square and open.

NORFOLK. Then *will* you tell me why you are dabbling in this destructive, disintegrating manipulation of a book which you were taught to accept as sacred?

MONSON. Oh ! there you are out, for the same authority that taught me to revere the Bible taught me to dig into it. Did not old Andover, where I was at the start and you at the finish, lay down the law to us for all time in the "infallible revelation which God constantly makes of himself in his works of creation, providence, and redemption" ? Creation, I take it, means science. Providence means history. Redemption means the Bible. Now, then, orthodoxy at its very fountain-head, which certainly you and I ought to agree is Andover, sends us forth on a legitimate quest for the Divine Being. You take the German scholars.

NORFOLK. No ; if you please.

MONSON. Well, then, you don't. But you seem to know about them.

NORFOLK. Enough not to accept them—at least in the lump.

MONSON. Say your professors, then ; your English and American authorities, your orthodox Germans, your Holtzmanns and your Hermanns, Strack and Dillman, and Zöchler and Lange. Very likely I should do the same if I had time. As it is, I take the Bible itself. And sometimes I think there is an advantage in just taking the Bible itself—alone.

NORFOLK. And is it from the Bible you get your assent to the higher criticism, to the German analyzing of the Bible out of existence ?

MONSON. Yes and no. So far as the Germans agree with me I agree with them, but my analysis gives the Bible a higher place, a stronger hold, even, than Andover gave it in the old days—for me.

NORFOLK. For instance ?

MONSON. Yes, indeed. But I shall bore you. Theology is shop for you, and you know when to stop, but it is fun to me, and I never get tired.

NORFOLK. Go on; *your* theology will be fun to me!

MONSON. I see and scorn. But open your King James's Bible and read the dedication: "Great and manifold were the blessings, most dread sovereign, which Almighty God, the Father of all mercies, bestowed upon us the people of England, when first he sent Your Majesty's Royal Person to rule and reign over us." What do you, a republican, understand by that? How did God send King James to rule and reign over us?

NORFOLK. In his Providence. By virtue of his being the next heir after Elizabeth. By virtue of his being born into an order which had reached a stage of development that made heredity, with some modifications, the will of the people.

MONSON. You do not for a moment suppose that Almighty God appeared in any manifest or miraculous personal manner to impose the Stuart on the English people, any more than he has appeared in our day to place Carnot in the French presidency, or Harrison in ours?

NORFOLK. Certainly not. There is no necessity for supposing anything of the sort. It is a canon of philosophy not to seek for unknown causes when known causes sufficiently explain the event.

MONSON. Now, then, you open the Bible and read that the Lord came down to see the city and the tower which the children of men builded, and confounded their language that they might not reach unto Heaven as they intended.

NORFOLK. Well!

MONSON. Well, it seems to me that the Lord did not *come down* to see the Tower of Babel any more than he came down to see the Tower of London. We have to sail to England, but the Lord is under no such necessity. Nor did he confuse the language of Shinar in any other sense than he is at this moment constituting Volapük.

NORFOLK. And do you fancy that you are original in that view ?

MONSON. Come, now ; there is your sarcasm again. I am not posing for an exegetical genius. Spare my real modesty.

NORFOLK. No ; but really, is there anything unusual or extraordinary in supposing that when God is spoken of in the Bible as if he were a man, it is the anthropomorphism of a child-like race and writer ?

MONSON. Child-like ? Why, it is not two weeks since I heard a reverend missionary say : "God means to make Germany a republic." All religious papers and pulpits teem with the designs and plans and purposes of God regarding politics and parties, and even individuals, as definitely as if he were retained on one side or the other.

NORFOLK. And a great deal of it is sincere. People that have a profound faith in a Divine Being see him in everything, and of course they must speak of him and even think of him in terms of human thought and speech. God is pure spirit. Man is spirit embodied. Pure spirit may address itself to spirit embodied, in the terms of pure spirit. But embodied spirit can not communicate with or even concerning pure spirit, except in terms of spirit embodied.

MONSON. Admirable ! That is not only reasonable, but suggestive. Tell me, now, how *you* build the Tower of Babel.

NORFOLK. I build it just as my friend Selden builds it, and as a great many others as judicious as the judicious Hooker. I mention Selden because I happen to have heard him talk it over last. The story was told in the anthropomorphical style which was so well suited to the childhood of the race ; and for that matter, as you intimate, we have not outgrown it yet.

MONSON. Only we rather confine it to religious, not to say ecclesiastical, circles.

NORFOLK. I imagine it was rather confined to religious circles then. The bad folks have not left us much account of themselves. Irreligion is a disintegrating, not a conservative, element.

MONSON. Even the Tower of Babel gets its immortality from those who voted against it.

NORFOLK. This childhood of the race, or we may say this popular simplicity or poverty of the mind, makes God real in his personality, direct in his dealings with men. The story has nothing to do with what we call "secondary causes," leaves "natural processes" entirely out of sight for the quickest and highest moral effect, attributes every event directly to God. Yet there is open to us, of a more observant and reflective age, a recognition of the delicate and natural methods by which providential results are secured. Undoubtedly the story of the Tower of Babel is but a condensed and graphic account of the beginning of national divergence—it was probably a premature and foolish attempt to plant a great city of people who had not reached the development in religion or civilization which is necessary to peace and prosperity in a great city; it was the futile attempt at unification and consolidation of a tribe that discerned and antagonized a tendency to separation. It was a picturesque representation of the breaking up of the human family into nations and subsequent subdivisions, and anticipates by three thousand years at least the brilliant conclusions of Max Müller and Baron Bunsen.

MONSON. Reuss did you say it was who makes this exposition?

NORFOLK. Reuss! you rascal! No! I said it was Selden, of Springfield. When you are meek you are always mischievous.

MONSON. I am innocent enough now; but, in all good conscience, if you let in your friend Selden, of Springfield, you can not rule out my friend Wright, of Oberlin.

NORFOLK. What has your friend Wright, of Oberlin, on his mind?

MONSON. Nothing about the Tower of Babel that I know of, but he has views on Sodom.

NORFOLK. Do they upsèt the Tower of Babel?

MONSON. They make a leaning tower of it, but it leans your way. Wright and Sir William Dawson seem to have put their heads together and destroyed Sodom after a novel and ingenious way, but natural fashion. The story of Sodom and Gomorrah is told at considerable length and with considerable definiteness. The style of the narrative is familiar. The Lord said: "Because the cry of Sodom and Gomorrah is great, and because their sin is grievous, I will go down now and see whether they have done altogether according to the cry of it which is come unto me, and if not I will know." That is written very much as if "the Lord" were a careful and conscientious editor of a morning newspaper, going out himself instead of sending a reporter, in order to get his news on the best authority. But it was not necessary for the Lord to *come down* to investigate Sodom any more than it was necessary for him to *come down* to see the Tower of Babel. Being omnipresent, he surveyed Sodom and Babel from one place no more than from another. Being omniscient, he knew their sin without special effort. But we, even we, can not speak of God without using human terms—terms of limitation. God is transcendent; therefore we can not inclose him, comprehend him, fully know him. But he is immanent; therefore we can partially know him and be in touch with him.

These keen observers conclude, from the examination of the country about the Dead Sea, and the other refer-

ences in the Bible, that Sodom and Gomorrah were destroyed by the bursting and burning of an immense pent-up reservoir of gas and petroleum.

The valley of the Jordan and the Dead Sea occupy a portion of a wonderful crevasse or crack in the earth's crust, and are subject to earthquakes. The limestone rocks are also strongly impregnated with petroleum products. In short, it has every appearance of being an exhausted "oil-district"; and nothing is more probable than the occurrence of such a scene as that described in Genesis. The "slime-pits" mentioned in Genesis as characterizing the region, and the recently discovered evidence of the use of bitumen in the construction of Jericho, give fresh reality to the scene and the whole situation; while the word which is translated brimstone, Wright thinks is more probably pitch. Any one who is familiar with a burning gas-well is quite at home in the Sodom and Gomorrah description.

NORFOLK. Surely that confirms rather than discredits the Bible narrative.

MONSON. I think so; but of course you observe that you have gone over—horse, foot, and dragoons—to the higher criticism!

NORFOLK. Of course I see nothing of the sort. To show *how* God does a thing is very different from saying that he does not do it. To explain the attendant circumstances of the catastrophe does not diminish its miraculous character, but only brings to light the secondary causes of which the Lord made use in bringing his designs to pass.

MONSON. Yes, I think Wright says something of that kind, but it looks amazingly like hedging; because if you explain attendant circumstances enough to show that the catastrophe was natural, you not only diminish but destroy its miraculous phase. If you bring to light sec-

ondary causes sufficient to produce it, you do not need, according to your own philosophical canon, to seek any further, and especially any unusual or miraculous cause.

NORFOLK. But the timing of it is that in which the miraculous element appears. Wright himself emphatically recognizes the miracle. He avers that the Lord saw to it that the torch was applied at the right time and place, and this was the great miracle. The production of such an eruption at that juncture was by direct design of the Creator, and serves all the purpose of a miracle. In fact, it was a miracle. The showers of burning naphtha and bitumen which came down upon Sodom and Gomorrah came no less from the Lord's hands because they were first belched up from the earth's depths by volcanic forces. The forces of nature, as Wright says, are powerful beyond our comprehension, and are all of them in such a state of unstable equilibrium that it is an easy matter for the Creator to direct them as he will. It is God who does this when the earthquake destroys a city, or a tornado devastates a hamlet, or a cloud bursts upon a mountain-side and carries destruction all along the valley.

SOPHIA. I am glad to see that science does not mean to overtask the Creator.

MONSON. Obscure.

SOPHIA. You say that Mr. Wright thinks it is easy for the Creator to direct the forces of Nature, because they are in such a state of unstable equilibrium. That is, I suppose, the fluidity of the oil and the gas and the lava makes them manageable, but, once solidified, they would have to stay where they are. If the pot boils, Mr. Wright's argument is, anything can be done with it; but, if the pot is not boiling, the Lord himself can not make it boil over!

MONSON. Very good theology, too, on right lines.

SOPHIA. Yes; but on the wrong lines, if on the old or on *an* old theological theory that God is not great unless he is greater than himself; as if God were more powerful in disorder than he is in order; as if it required more Godhood to break a law than to make a law; as if any one could start a universe awhirl in regular curves, but only a God could whirl it all awry and athwart.

MONSON. And just here, Norfolk, if I were up in my Zöchler and Edersheim and the rest of them, I should say is where you and Wright blur a little. You speak as if design were all one with miracle. Timing the torch you say was the great miracle. But the torch must be timed if it is to *be* a torch. An eruption at that juncture, you say, was by direct design of God. An eruption must always be at some juncture, and whenever it comes it is by design of God. *I* do not believe it breaks out of its own will at random, even outside the Bible. The explosion, you say, came no less from God's hands because it was belched up by volcanic forces. True; but we never call a volcano a miracle.

NORFOLK. If, however, an angel from heaven appeared to warn you that a volcano was to break out at a certain time, and that you must rush to another region to escape it, and you did rush and did escape, and the explosion came at the time foretold, would you not call that a miracle?

MONSON. If I were a devout and sensible, but not a scientific, man—

NORFOLK. You need not put an undisputed fact in a hypothetical form.

MONSON. Thanks; but I will stick to my hypothesis —living with my family in Sodom, and if some man who was more learned than I in the nature of gas-wells and oil districts, and earth crevasses and naphtha spurts, and the general premonitory symptoms of seismic or other

earth disturbances, should come into Sodom and warn the people that a convulsion of nature was threatened, and if most of the people did not believe him, as people are apt not—witness Johnstown—and if I should think there was reason enough in his warnings to warrant me in heeding them, and *should* heed them and save my family, while my neighbors stayed at home and perished —why, I think that I should feel like the English under King James, that God Almighty had sent his servant to deliver me. I should feel that the man who had warned me was the angel of the Lord.

NORFOLK. So you abstract every miraculous element from the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, and make it a mere natural phenomenon in all its developments.

MONSON. No, it is you that do that—you and Selden and Wright—orthodox, common-sense, right-seeing men that you are. I only claim my rights under the law. If you assume to say that when the Lord rained brimstone and fire out of heaven upon Sodom and Gomorrah, it was probably pitch, and first came up out of the earth in the natural order of things, without any special interposition of divine power, I assume to say that when the Lord warned Lot of his danger by two angels who are distinctly and repeatedly called men, they *were* men. At any rate, they *may have been* men, warning Lot by their natural knowledge. I have the same right to say they were men that you have to say that brimstone was pitch or that fire from heaven was fire from earth.

NORFOLK. You admit, then, that you do rule out every element of the miraculous.

MONSON. No, only that I have the right to rule it out without any impeachment of my orthodoxy. Because I am a layman and a politician and do not flout at, any more than I follow, the higher criticism, have I not the power to lead about a little "natural-process" rule to

measure the Scriptures with as well as you and the other apostles?

NORFOLK. Oh! you need not square off into fisticuffs.

MONSON. Not a bit of it! True orthodoxy has no need of that. Why, look at Josephus, a Jew true blue, if ever there was one. He does not scruple to say: "God cast a thunderbolt upon Sodom and set it on fire." There need be no miracle in a natural cause, except the perennial miracle of Nature. Josephus is no more authority than you and I, but he shows that the Jews, eighteen hundred years nearer to Sodom than we, and in direct descent from Moses and his coadjutors, fell instinctively into the line of Nature's methods.

NORFOLK. But I should really like to know, higher criticism apart, what is your honest private interpretation of the whole narrative?

MONSON. Very simple, and quite on the lines where you lead off. I do not fight for my interpretation, but for my right to make it without impeachment of my character; not for the truth of my interpretation, but for its legitimacy and orthodoxy. I am then inclined to think that in the Scripture story of Sodom and Gomorrah we have the record of an old-world Johnstown disaster, or perhaps the Pompeii and Herculaneum of the world before Christ—a condensed and graphic account of the destruction of a populous and prosperous plain where luxury had engendered corruption. That it was destruction by the forces of Nature we have much trace to-day. The newspapers of that day were full of it. It made a sensation, just as it would if it were the news of our morning paper. The record is made by a religious man in the anthropomorphic style which makes God a real, direct, and limited personality—the only way in which the writer could conceive of God at all. One man escaped —a man of large wealth and great family connections.

The story of his escape is told in the same anthropomorphic, picturesque, condensed style. The devout writer deals in neither case with second causes, with natural processes, but attributes everything directly to God. I attribute everything not the less to God, because, being born of a more observant and reflective age, I recognize the delicate and natural methods by which Lot may have been rescued as well as those by which Sodom may have been destroyed.

SOPHIA. When you read that Lot's wife, delaying, became a pillar of salt, you can hardly help thinking of those thirty-seven delaying Pompeiians, asphyxiated by deadly gases, caught in a shower and suffocation of ashes, lying this moment as they have been lying for eighteen hundred years, every spasm of pain, every contortion of the living muscles preserved and presented in the moistened, hardened cast—a pillar of ashes. Just so may Lot's wife, perhaps lingering, perhaps looking back with longing, or love, or curiosity, perhaps only weak and terrified and unable to flee further—just so may she have been caught, overpowered by the rolling noxious vapors and incrusted into a form of stalagmite, a statue of crystal death, a pillar of salt! Poor, scared creature!

NORFOLK. If, along with the story of a disaster so great that it was immortalized, there is recorded an equally signal rescue, do you not think that the presumption in favor of the truth of the miraculous rescue is as strong as that in favor of the disaster, which is universally admitted to be true?

MONSON. Oh! now you *are* mixing things!

NORFOLK. Well, then, analyze me and take me in single file.

MONSON. First, then, to take the last. The misery of our irrational Bible reading is that nothing is universally admitted to be true. Insisting that the story of Lot

should be taken without atmosphere, or antiquity, poetry, or imagination, in an impossible and unliterary sense, we have caused that many would not take it at all. It is only of late years that personal and scientific investigation on the spot, and the opening up of our own material resources, have given independent evidence of historic truth in the story, at least to the popular mind—to my mind, let us say. Your superior—

NORFOLK. Oh! let my superior mind alone. Go on with your exposition. I never meddle too minutely with my congregation, and I never give them taffy—at least individually.

MONSON. That last was well put in. I have been your congregation, you know. Well, thanks to outsiders, rather than to exegetes, yet thanks perhaps to clergymen most of all, the Sodom story is getting into universal credit by being shown to be possible, even to the reason. But now as to the miraculous rescue. Not the writer. He tells his story as simply as the King James translators, as simply as my returned missionary placed Almighty God on the Republican side. None of them give sign of relating a miracle. It is the simple, slight record of events, great, worthy of note, but not unnatural. As to its being a single rescue I am not at all sure. The record is Jewish. Lot was the only one the writer cared about, he being connected with the great Jewish founder, Abraham.

NORFOLK. You would not lay stress, nor I either, on the destruction of "all the inhabitants" of the cities?

MONSON. No more than I should include the North American Indians in the decree that went out from Cæsar Augustus that all the world should be taxed.

NORFOLK. Ah, well! I don't consider you a hopeless case, though I don't yet give you clean papers.

SOPHIA. President White would not give either of you

clean papers. As far as I can see, he sweeps Lot's wife clean out of existence.

NORFOLK. Ye take too much upon you, ye sons of Levi.

SOPHIA. This son of Levi does not display an overgrasping spirit. He simply traces the story back as far as he can, and finds it ending in myth.

NORFOLK. But even myth has an origin.

MONSON. And a divine origin.

SOPHIA. That is President White's position, apparently. The myth is the natural husk and rind and shell of our best ideas. He simply traces the growth of this one myth. Sodom, modern Usdum, has a low range of hills mainly made up of salt rock which is soft and friable, and by the heavy winter rains is and has been without doubt for unknown ages cut ever into new shapes, especially into pillars and columns, which sometimes bear a resemblance to the human form.

NORFOLK. And he thinks the whole story was made up to fit the pillars of salt?

SOPHIA. A dangerous stand to take, in these days of Egyptian explorations.

MONSON. Yes; the Tel-el-Amarna tablets admonish the higher critic to look well to his steps before he undertakes to destroy the Pentateuch, even as history.

SOPHIA. Lot's wife will have a sweet revenge on Cornell University in the day when the diary of some literary gentleman or some fashionable princess of Sodom is dug up out of the sulphur rock of Usdum, containing the imperishable and indisputable record of the lady's visiting list.

NORFOLK. It would be no more strange than the grocery bills and real-estate-sales lists of Babylon.

SOPHIA. President White, however, does not think there are any ruins to be dug up under the Dead Sea, but that the sea has always been there.

NORFOLK. That is an old theory.

MONSON. It is I alone who am not walking on thin ice. I do not commit myself to any one interpretation, but to the right of interpretation. Whether historically, mythically, poetically, or literally interpreted is a matter of culture, and not a matter of religious faith. My contention is only with the man who tells me that I must read it his way or I am not sound. I am willing to give up any way on evidence, but I am not willing to give up my right of way.

## CHAPTER II.

### THE REAL GENESIS.

READING the Bible as we should read any other book, regardless of what men in all ages have taught about the Bible, what do we find ?

In the beginning—God.

Whether "beginning" means the time when the universe began as protoplasm, or when the earth began as planet, or what is protoplasm or what is universe, are questions for science, not for religion. What the Bible teaches is that, In the beginning—not force, or law, or energy, or a fortuitous concourse of atoms, but—God created the heaven and the earth.

The story of the creation is to be read in the broad light and interpreted by the large lines of common language and common sense.

God said, Let there be light.

God said, I am tired of kings.

There is no reason to suppose that the Genesis writer held his words to a more rigid meaning than Emerson. Both used a rhetorical and poetic impersonation in order to a vivid and imposing presentation of truth. No one supposes that Emerson meant a miraculous voice out of heaven. No one need suppose that the Genesis author meant it.

The Genesis of the Bible is a pictorial representation of creation—as it might appear to an earth-dweller unfolding

in a swift panorama. It is creation in its relation to man. The object of the great lights is to give light upon the earth. He made the stars also. There is no word of the vast revolving globes, centers of other systems, universes of universes, in numbers and spaces inconceivable. The writer, the seer, sees only what they are to us—stars; created, so far as the Genesis picture is concerned, on the day when the seer saw their dim twinkling through the dense but clearing atmosphere of earth's earlier stages. There is in it a singular and, as yet, unexplained correspondence between this unfolding panorama and the conclusions of science; but if there were no correspondence at all, the import of the Bible would be unaffected. As a pictorial representation, it teaches, whether by scientific accuracy or inaccuracy, the creation by God, a creation of order, of power without effort, of dignity, of beneficence, of satisfaction. This revelation of God appears on the face of it, and this is the only revelation that is vital. Its historical or scientific quality is interesting, but it is a question for scholars, not for us. We have a keen interest in the results of their learning, but we have not the qualities, or the training, or the traits which enable us to take part in the search. We have culture enough to see that the authority of the Bible is not involved in the quest.

That there is any trouble about the Garden of Eden is because, though God hath made man upright, man hath sought out many inventions. The Lord God, beyond doubt, planted a garden eastward in Eden, just as he planted a forest westward in America, by the forces of nature, whether through man with farming-tools, or by the winds of heaven, or the wings of bird and bee and butterfly, scattering seeds. Nothing can exceed the marvel of such planting. We have seen the forest primeval and have never lost ourselves in that wood. What is there to bewilder us among the trees of Eden, the Garden

of God? Josephus, reared in all the traditions of his nation for thorough soundness of interpretation, thought it no new departure to say, affirms it as the simplest statement of natural fact, that "our legislator speaks some things wisely but enigmatically, and others under a decent allegory, but still explains such things as required a direct explication, plainly and expressly."

Having laid down this general law of interpretation, he specifically adds: "After the seventh day was over, Moses begins to talk philosophically," by which we understand not literally.

The story of Adam and Eve is a parable, an allegory, by its own showing. In any other book than the Bible a story of animals talking would be called a fable, would be recognized as fable.

> "I shall not ask Jean Jacques Rousseau
> If birds confabulate or no.
> 'Tis plain that they were always able
> To hold discourse at least in fable;
> And even the child who knows no better
> Than to interpret by the letter
> The story of a cock and bull
> Must have a most uncommon skull."

When we read in a story-book, "The lion said to the mouse," we perceive at once that it is a fable. When we read in the Bible, "The serpent said unto the woman," we call it history. There is no reason why we should. There is no more reason to suppose that snakes talk in the Bible than that they talk in other literature. There is even less reason, for the Bible itself in other places speaks of the serpent as not a serpent, but an evil spirit, showing that the Bible writers considered it allegory.

To say that it is fable or allegory is not to say that it is false. The very point and pith of fable is truth. An allegory has no life but in its truth. Was it Lacordaire

who said "a myth is a fact transfigured by an idea"? Is it wise—is it the only real orthodoxy—is it orthodoxy at all—is it not rather the worst heresy—to insist upon the fact without the idea? Is a fact more holy—more imposing—when it stands alone, unclassified, unmeaning, and in its nakedness absurd, than when it stands in its relations, invested with its associations, inspired with its idea, and lifted thus into the sphere of moral and spiritual life?

Out of the ground made the Lord God to grow every tree that is pleasant to the sight and good for food; the tree of life also in the midst of the garden, and the tree of knowledge of good and evil. The mixture of literal and allegorical language is unquestionable. Who ever carried to market a basket of the fruit of the tree of life? Who ever heard of a knowledge-of-good-and-evil orchard? The literal interpretation never would have been thought of any more than in the lion-and-mouse fables but for the exigences of theology. Men constructed fables about theology, and then supported them with the fables of the Bible turned into literal statements; and this in full view of the constant Bible use of the phrase in a figurative sense: She [wisdom] is a tree of life to them that lay hold upon her. The fruit of the righteous is a tree of life. When the desire cometh it is a tree of life. A wholesome tongue is a tree of life. To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life which is in the midst of the paradise of God. In the midst of the street of it, and on either side of the river, was there the tree of life which bore twelve manner of fruits, and yielded her fruit every month; and the leaves of the tree were for the healing of the nations. Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life. And whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely.

The allegory is solemn and sublime. All may read its truth of divine sovereignty, of human responsibility, of inherent penalty. Its specific truths we as yet only infer or even conjecture. It may be the parable of man's first investiture with a moral nature, the last stage in his evolution from animal innocence to the human possibility of guilt and achievement of holiness. Adam, Edom, red earth, may be an epitome of the race; the story of the fall of one man enshrining the rise of all men.

It is possible that the trail of the serpent in the Garden of Eden may still be seen in the mysterious mounds of the West. Professor Putnam considers the great serpent mound to be a relic of the serpent worship which prevailed throughout the world thousands of years ago. We see its symbolism sometimes still in our rings and bracelets, lithe and clinging with serpentine gold—type of wisdom, type of eternity. The serpentine mounds still to be found in various parts of the world were temples of the serpent worship. Within the coil of the tail was built the altar of sacrifice. Why may it not be that the serpent of the story of Eden was the abstract personified typical serpent of the early world's worship, the great dragon, Satan, just disappearing, perhaps just beginning to disappear, before the clearer revelation of God to a more highly developed man? "It shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel," would thus receive a fuller meaning. The new direct God-worship would have a hard fight with the old serpent-worship; but after the fight—nay, in the fight—it would prevail.

It has prevailed. It has left only here and there a mark, a myth, a mystery—a weird, colossal serpent mound on the grassy cliffs of Ohio.

But the scientific historic explanation, correspondence or divergence, is not a matter of orthodoxy, or heterodoxy, or heresy. It is a matter of the utmost interest; but it is

for learning to decide. The essential point is clear to all: God's sovereignty, man's responsibility, inherent penalty, eternal righteousness. No theological school, or synod, or council, or individual can rightfully lay upon the conscience the interpretation of the creation of Genesis. But is not this rationalism? I trust it is; and perhaps, before we go any further, it would be well to try if we may not lay that ghost.

What is rationalism? The bugbear of the churches for one thing. Only a bugbear so far as the churches are alarmed. Rationalism is *reasoningism*. No deeper insult can be put upon the Bible than to say that it can not stand reasoning.

When we speak, as we often do speak, of the controversy between the rationalist and the orthodox, we employ what the logicians term the fallacy of division. There is no logical classification into orthodox and rationalist. I may be less than the least of the orthodox, but all there is of me is orthodox. I may have been endowed by Heaven with but a feeble spark of reason, but all that heaven has given me of reason I will use upon theology; therefore I am always and wholly a rationalist.

In the discussion regarding revision, one man contended that it is important to put the brakes on any tendency to rationalism proper when it shows itself in our American life, as, unchecked, it will rapidly develop and prove in the end fatal to evangelical religion among us as it did in Germany prior to Schleiermacher.

It would be well to learn who has authority to put on the brakes. The attempt would be more likely to throw off the brakeman than to slow the train!

To say that rationalism is fatal to evangelical religion is to say that evangelical religion can exist only among idiots.

Was Canon Kingsley an idiot? He was assuredly a rationalist. Hear what the most straitest sect of New

England Puritanism, in old Andover and Princeton, says of him :

"Kingsley's theology was never very coherent, consistent, or orthodox. He was greatly influenced by Maurice, whom he revered as his 'prophet;' he was a leader of the Broad Church ; and went farthest from the straight line in his inferential 'restorationism,' in eschatology. Still his influence was hurtful rather in the encouragement of others to depart from the truth than in his own distinct teachings ; for he was a strong upholder of the Athanasian creed, and was reverent, though somewhat free, in his treatment of the Scriptures. . . . But few will be found who were such a tremendous force in their day for good. He had much of the prophet in his make-up and commission. Dean Stanley says, in his funeral sermon : 'His life and conversation, as he walked among ordinary men, were often as of a waker among drowsy sleepers.' And there has been no more 'pure and perfect knight,' none more dedicated to what seemed to him the right, who wore his heart on his sleeve and his sword at the service of the weak, than he who lies restfully amid the grass, the wild flowers, and the tall fir trees of the secluded parish church where he loved so much and made so many love him."

Let orthodoxy reconcile the evasive, elusive, theoretical, inferential "hurtful influence" of his rationalism with the "tremendous force for good," the pure and perfect character, the righteousness and the chivalry which it left, if it did not make, in his character.

Was Bunsen an idiot? Hear what the same high conservative authority says of him : "We can not and care not to recapitulate Bunsen's sad lapses into rationalism in this and other works, such as his abandonment of prophecy, and even his denial of the resurrection of Jesus. And yet, strange to say, he not only opposed in-

tensely the rationalism of Baur, Feuerbach, and the Tübingen school, not to speak of Strauss, but he lived in the Scriptures, and clung to them as the object of supremest love and the only source of spiritual life. The fact is that Bunsen was an enigma, or, perhaps we might say, a theological 'Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde,' with a rationalistic head and an evangelical heart."

Why, then, rationalism is *not* fatal to evangelical religion even in Germany! But listen again:

"No one has questioned the reality and depth of his piety. Dr. McCosh gives this emphatic testimony: 'I am able to say, what I believe I can say of no other with whom I had so much intercourse, that we never conversed during those five days for ten minutes at a time without his returning, however far he might be off, to his Bible and his Saviour, as the objects which were the dearest to him. . . .

"Bunsen was absolutely free from all concealment. In the most worldly and unbelieving circles, as among the most intimate and like-minded, he was the same outspoken Christian. So great was his simplicity and transparency of character, that the Russian Ambassador said to him: 'Continue to keep your child-heart; you are the only child of fifty years old I ever saw.' Everywhere Bunsen was the same natural, genial, high-minded man. His presence was a burst of sunshine. . . .

"Bunsen's was one of the notable death-beds of Christian history, not only for the beauty of human love, but pre-eminently for a triumphant and unwavering faith and a rapturous love of Christ, which would have crowned the life of any saint that ever lived. To sum up his heart-orthodoxy, let me add one of his latest sayings in a letter: 'The Lord taught me early that I am a sinner, and that only in Christ I can become well-pleasing to God and a child of God.'

"'Few souls have lived so brightly and serenely, so far above the meanness of selfish aims and petty jealousies'; and so long as faith, hope, and love take their place among the things that can not be shaken, his immortality is assured."

Was Neander's rationalism fatal to his religion? The same evangelical leader says: "I regret to be obliged to confess that, like Bunsen, he was pious in spite of decided weakness of theological opinion. He never lost the early influence of Schleiermacher. His views of the inspiration and authority of the Scriptures—even of parts of the Gospels as well as the Apocalypse and some of the Epistles—are very latitudinarian, if not loose."

But what of his character and his influence?

"Imagine a bowed and slender man, with a decidedly Jewish physiognomy, deep-set but keen eyes, high and broad forehead almost covered by thick black hair, and eyebrows like a shaggy and jutting roof. He wears a white cravat, as often tied on the side or back of his neck as at the front, his long frock-coat and all his clothes carrying out the Israelitish impression of his appearance after the Chatham Street type; an old-fashioned hat set aslant on the back of his head, and jack-boots reaching above the knees. And yet, wherever he appears on the streets, he is greeted by all sorts of people with reverence and affection. Many stories, more or less authenticated, are told of his uncouthness and absent-mindedness—as, for instance, his getting his foot into the gutter and walking thus all the way home, and then sending in haste to a physician to consult about his supposed lameness. He would have to be guided, both in going to and returning from his lecture-room, especially if he had changed his residence; and he was apt to continue writing upon his desk after he had come to the end of his paper.

"His attitudes and behavior in the lecture-room were

still more grotesque and *bizarre*. He shot in sideways and with half-closed eyes, and, on taking his seat, began to fumble for a goose-quill, without which he could not proceed; and if it gave out, through his twistings and tearings, another had to be furnished or he would be quite disconcerted. He stood, but constantly changed the position of his feet, even swinging one of them around till it struck the wall behind him.

"This description is not exaggerated, but attested by many of his pupils" [one of whom was a member of the Bible class and of the diplomatic corps, and certified the correctness of the presentation], "who, however dazed at first, came to regard it with gravity, and even with reverence, as a part of the greatness and almost superhuman inspiration of the man. No one thought of laughing at what, after all, added to the sense of dignity, enthusiasm, and unworldly purity of this 'Israelite indeed, in whom was no guile.' They all loved him, and on every birthday marched in torchlight procession through the city and stopped at his house in order to address him and receive his reply.

"His conversion from Judaism was a slow process, and self-wrought out under the leading and enlightening of the Holy Ghost. He seems, like Augustine and others, to have received the first impulse from Plato, both away from his old faith and on toward higher ideals. Schleiermacher also, 'the German Plato,' had a great influence upon his development, and, in fact, stamped the character of his theology to a large extent. On his last birthday he spoke in a voice trembling with emotion, calling himself 'only a poor sinner,' and exclaiming with St. Augustine, 'O Divine Love, I have not loved Thee strongly, deeply, warmly enough!' This gives us a good idea of Neander's character—its humility, simplicity, love, and unworldly innocence and integrity. Says one of his

pupils, Dr. Schaff: 'To understand and admire in its true living force that great word of the Redeemer, "Except ye become as little children ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven," it was only necessary to become acquainted with Neander.'

"Bishop Huntington says: 'Few eyes have seen deeper into God's majestic disclosures than those which looked out from under the dark Hebrew brow of the Christian historian, Neander. Yet this was the motto which he kept inscribed on his study wall, making his library to open upward into heaven: "Now we see through a glass darkly, but then face to face!" He died as he had lived, in the midst of his work and in perfect calmness of submission to the voice of God. On Sunday, the 8th of July, he insisted upon lecturing, though so weak as to lose his voice several times and to be unable to descend from the rostrum and get home without being carried by his students. Yet in the afternoon he rallied, and managed to dictate for three hours the closing pages of his Church History. He never rose again from his bed; yet on Saturday afternoon he dictated that fine chapter on the German mystics of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, who were called the "Friends of God." Then, in a dreamy state of mind, he said to his sister, "I am weary, let us go home"; and immediately afterward, with tenderness and affection to his kind attendant, "Good-night," he fell gently asleep and awoke to look face to face upon the Christ who led him out of darkness into the light where we need no glass and are conscious of no dimness.'"

Professor Delitzsch has just died; was rationalism fatal to his evangelical piety? The Rev. Dr. Curtiss, Professor of Hebrew in the Chicago Theological Seminary, was his admiring pupil and sympathetic friend. He admits that some of Professor Delitzsch's interpretations

were fanciful, but says "he was one of the few who knew how to sympathize with the ancient prophets and psalmists of Israel, and hence how to render their thoughts into modern language.

"He suffered much from radical critics who did not know how anxious he was to present no views which he thought would be detrimental to the Church of Christ. There was at times in his mind a struggle, which came from the conviction that certain critical views were true, and from his fear that the frank expression of these views might be a stumbling-block in the way of some foreign missionary or some of his former pupils. While he had a mind which was hospitable for all phases of truth, he was cautious and considerate in its expression from principle. He sometimes made a remark like this, 'Another concession made for the sake of the truth.' In his later years, while he was an earnest advocate of evangelical theology, his critical views, as is well known, were much modified by the investigations of the modern school.

"He was a man of devotional spirit and of devout piety. The cause of evangelical religion lay very near his heart. His love for Israel was hardly exceeded by that of the Apostle Paul, and he devoted about fifty years to the preparation and perfection of the New Testament in Hebrew, reckoning from the time when the purpose of preparing such a translation first entered his mind.

"While he was a strict adherent of the Lutheran Church, he firmly believed that 'if any man is in Christ he is a new creature.' I heard him remark one morning, after listening to the discourse of one of the younger professors at the University Church: 'That man does not know anything about true religion. He has never been converted.'

"Thus a prince and a father in Israel has left us, and

we must wait long before we see any one worthy to take his place."

Is it that these men did not live "prior to Schleiermacher"? But neither do we. If there is any potency in Schleiermacher, imparting vitality to a rationalism which prior to him contained only the seeds of death, we also are heirs to that potency, and have no relation whatever to any preceding rationalism which bore only evil fruits.

Looking at these men, at their consecrated life, at their peaceful death, at their holy memory, we should say that rationalism, so far from rending away in agony the Christ from our view, rather rends away the clouds that hide the Christ, and permits us to look upon that benign and blessed face undimmed.

"I am proud of the fact," says an eminent Methodist leader, "that the scholarship of the churches is not wholly in the grip of the rationalists. There is not a Methodist institution, or a Methodist periodical, or, so far as I know, a single Methodist minister, who has joined the higher critics in their destructive historical and literary work, notwithstanding Mr. Faulkner, in his effort to carry the charge of rationalism in the church, assumed that many Methodist clergymen are in the bonds of that great iniquity."

If the scholarship of the churches is not amenable to reason, it is in the bonds of a great imbecility. If the Methodist Church has no tendency to bring its theology to the bar of reason, it is a far more effete institution than its vigorous condition would indicate. Put down the brakes on reason? There is but one way to do it. Burn the reasoner! It is not the Methodist Church which is credited with that monopoly. It is too late for the Methodist Church to introduce it. Even Bruno does not stay burned. The oxygen of the nineteenth century

is constantly reillumining him. So magnificently have our fathers wrought—our orthodox, iron-bound fathers—that they have freed our reason to perfect liberty.

"If they should revise rationalism into the Confession," say the Presbyterian watchmen, "there will be an interminable war until one party or the other is cast out."

On the contrary, when rationalism is revised into the Confession there will be everlasting peace, and never till then. All the war comes because reason is outside and orthodoxy inside. Until they are at one inside—that is, until orthodoxy is perfectly reasonable—this conflict is irrepressible.

"Presbyterians, if they are anything, are intelligent and pious. They know what they believe, because they have committed to memory the Shorter Catechism. They know why they believe, because they have studied their Bibles."

It might be supposed that the more decorous and deferential way would be to learn from the Bible what to believe and from the Catechism why you believe. But pious and intelligent Presbyterians are too wise in their generation to fancy for a moment that the Westminster Catechism can explain anything to anybody. It is very clever in them to commit the Catechism to memory and the Bible to reason.

But, say the Literalists, rationalism takes away our infallible Bible and puts reason to judge revelation.

What is an infallible Bible? The multiplication-table is infallible, but is of no use to us until we learn it. If we know nothing of numbers and can not read figures, the multiplication-table might as well be fallible so far as we are concerned. We must put our memory to the multiplication-table and our reason to applying it before we get any good out of it.

So even an infallible Bible is practically fallible so long as the minds that use it are fallible. Rationalists put reason to judge revelation? What ought to judge revelation? Revelation is addressed to reason. It is God who puts reason to judge revelation. There is no revelation where there is no reason. Cats and dogs, birds and fishes, have no revelation because they have not reason. God reveals himself and can reveal himself only through and to the reason of man, and he himself constantly appeals to man to use his reason in judging God. How can any man upbraid his fellow-man for doing what God constantly in the Bible exhorts, and outside the Bible stimulates, man to do!

Let us apply rationalism and non-rationalism to the infallible Bible in the story of Abram. Abram had several wives. He drove away one wife and her son—his son—to die in the wilderness. He was about to murder another son. The tale is interesting, but what of it, if we are not to use reason? It is simply a story like any fairy tale.

Oh, no! says the anti-rationalist, the irrationalist. These things happened for ensamples, as Paul says, and they are written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world are come.

But that is rationalism! Paul, then, is a rationalist. He is not contented with the infallible Genesis, but adds a comment, a moral, an interpretation of his own. He puts his reason to judge Moses's revelation. He is not content with the simple narrative as Moses gave it, but invests the narrative with a Pauline motive. And what is the result? Under his lead, taking Abram for an ensample, we learn that polygamy is legal and righteous, and the Mormons are true saints, as they call themselves, and those who oppose the Mormons are fighting against God. As Abraham was obedient to sacrifice his only son, Freeman of Massachusetts must have been right in kill-

ing his little daughter as a sacrifice to God, and the Massachusetts law was wrong in shutting him into the Danvers lunatic asylum.

No, continues the anti-rationalist, still dissatisfied with our reasoning, and demanding more. The plurality of wives and the sacrifice of Isaac were due to the imperfect light of those barbarous early days. We are not to imitate Abraham in those points. They were not the ones given for our ensample. It is Abram's faith that we are to follow. He was ready to do what God told him to do, even to the sacrifice of his own son. The lesson to us is of equally prompt obedience. The things Abraham did would be wrong in our day, but his faith in God, his entire submission, were counted to him for righteousness.

Here is a long process of rationalism. The conservatives resort to it because without it the story of Abram is but nonsense verses. They go on until rationalism takes them to a stopping-place which satisfies *them* —that is, to a point where we can be ordered to copy Abram's faith and not his crimes, or what would now be crimes. There they choose to stop, and there they bid every one else stop. But having gone so far in their company, who shall forbid us to go a step further on our own account, and point out that Abram's faith is summoned by Paul to show the earthly origin of the Mosaic law? The Mosaic law was not only to be destroyed for the future. We see by Abraham that it was not eternal in the past, for the apostle says that Abraham was without law. He had nothing but faith in God. The law had not been established in his day, so he was justified, gained his reputation, obtained all his character, without the law of Moses. God is divine, eternal, and faith in him is always a saving faith. The law of Moses was temporary, a mere human device, to be

outgrown and cast off. That is Paul's argument, and it is our argument; but it is rationalism in Paul just as much as in us. Will any orthodox Methodist, or Presbyterian, or Episcopalian think it incumbent on him to put the brakes on this tendency in Paul? But if rationalism is to be kept out of the Creed and the Confession and the Thirty-nine Articles, it ought to be revised out of the Holy Scriptures.

And what becomes of the infallible Bible? It was not infallible in the hands of Brigham Young, who interpreted its teachings into polygamy. It was not infallible in the hands of Freeman, who murdered his little daughter under its inspiration. It is not infallible to any man further than the Spirit of the Almighty giveth him understanding.

But the conservative, the anti-rationalist, says that you shall not put your understanding at work on the Bible and find out what it means. He says that is putting reason to judge revelation. What he means is that it is putting your reason to judge revelation, when he requires you to take his reason instead.

If you persist, if you will not take his reason, instead of using your own, he charges you with the self-conceit and arrogance of maintaining that there is a "Christian consciousness which is so far superior to the Bible in authority that it . . . may interpret it, from Genesis to the Apocalypse, to suit itself," and "is competent to sit in judgment upon the word of God, and to decide that it must mean some things and can not mean other things."

Hear what the infallible Bible says: For there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom in the grave whither thou goest.

On the face of it, this means that death ends all. Looking a little further at the circumstances and character of the speaker, it seems to mean the weary despair of

a worn-out voluptuary. But this is putting reason to judge revelation. This is sitting in judgment on the Word of God. You must say that it means eternal nothingness after death, or you place your Christian consciousness above the Bible. The Bible is infallible, and you are not competent to sit in judgment upon it: therefore, the Bible teaches annihilation.

If a friend writes you a letter, you must not pretend to understand it. That is to decide what it does and does not mean. That would be accounting yourself superior to your friend. That would be sitting in judgment on his letter. But, you naturally ask, Why, then, does he write? What is gained by writing a letter to a man who is incompetent to judge of its meaning?

What is it to interpret words to suit yourself? Whom must you suit? Must you interpret a word by another man's understanding or your own, as you believe it to be or as you believe it not to be?

The same paragraph which indicts the Christian consciousness for assuming to be superior to the Bible declares that "two considerations necessarily underlie and control the interpretation of all writing and speech: its terms and our conception of the sense to be put upon them."

What is that but a complete surrender? "Its terms" =the Bible. "Our conception of the sense to be put on them"="interpreting the Bible to suit ourselves," "sitting in judgment upon the word of God," "deciding that it may mean one thing and can not mean another." Yet this very thing which the Christian consciousness is reproached for bringing to bear on the Bible, the writer in the same breath declares absolutely indispensable to bring to bear on *all* interpretation of *all* writing. Human consciousness must decide all writing; Christian consciousness must not decide Bible writing.

Another theological reasoner says on one page: "That our consciousness is not mendacious, lies at the foundation of all our thinking and feeling and well-being." Then straightway forgetting what manner of being he is, he hurls at an erring progressive brother on the same day and in the same place an exultant and "thorough exposure of the theory that the Christian consciousness is the court of ultimate appeal." He even lavishes himself on warnings and prophecies that "he who carries his Bible into the world to find out what its doctrines are, and what its precepts mean, will find that the more he trusts himself to the teachings, even of imperfectly sanctified fallen human nature, the greater will be his ultimate error and downfall."

Here, then, are the propositions:

To trust consciousness is at the very foundation of right thinking and right living.

To trust Christian consciousness, even our own fortified by that of other men, is to compass error and downfall.

And this writer is a doctor of divinity, an Andover graduate, a college graduate, a New Englander born and bred under Plymouth Rock. What do you suppose he thinks he means? What does a man do with his mind while he is putting two contradictory propositions at short range on the same page? What does he think we are doing with our minds when we are reading them? Such irrationalism in a teacher is unpardonable. You and I—women—who are busy with the thousand nameless, unnoted but imperative duties of life—

> "We poor women, feeble-natured, large of heart, in wisdom small,
> Who the world's incessant battle can not understand at all"—

we are not expected to be logical, or even to understand logic. We may, in our small way, jump a syllogism, dash up against a fallacy, and not forfeit our right to

self-respect! But for a man, a college graduate, a voter, a legislator, a theological professor and teacher with the Westminster Catechism at his tongue's end, to put upon the same page, fronting each other, glaring at each other, two contradictory statements that can only devour each other—is for a man to invite woman into the pulpit!

When Protestant conservatism is arguing against the Pope it is as strong a rationalist as any philosopher could ask.

Rome or reason was perhaps never set forth more clearly and conclusively than on the pages of an evangelical newspaper that is foremost in the struggle against reason: "As we look at it, only two alternatives are possible in this matter of an infallible faith; either the conditions of it exist outside of the soul in some constituted and certified authority, or within the soul in the purest and loftiest exercise of its reason. If outside of the soul, in any central and constituted authority, then in the Pope. If inside the soul, then God remits every man to those conditions of secure decision which he has established in his breast, and holds him responsible for a judgment and a life founded upon them. God never commands men to hang their faith on the Pope or the Bishop; but rather inquires—in that tone of asking which is equivalent to the highest form of injunction—'Why [*aph' heauton*] out of your own selves do ye not judge what is right?' The entire appeal of the apostle is to the tribunal of the Hebrews' reason as the court of ultimate decision.

"We are even prepared to go so far as to claim that, as human nature has been divinely constituted, it is a psychological impossibility for any man to waive this prerogative of being the supreme authority over himself in regard to his religion.

"There lies before us a recent number of a religious

quarterly containing an elaborate article entitled An Infallible Church, or an Infallible Book—which? the great object of which is to dethrone the Pope and enthrone the Bible, as the subject of indubitable faith, with that religious certitude with which it may logically comfort the soul. To quote its own language, it would make the Bible 'the supreme and only arbiter in things spiritual.' And this, it thinks, would cause 'divisions to cease among us forever.' But this forgets that the Bible is always at the mercy of its interpreters, and its unity becomes continual diversity—being all things to all men, as they compel it, by the manner in which they receive it.

"It is, then, both the privilege and the duty of every man to be a law unto himself; and out of his own reason and conscience to judge what is right. From the decision which he thus reaches there can be, for him, no appeal. Whether it is anybody else's duty to follow the course prescribed therein or not, it is *his* duty to do so. He has pleaded his cause before *his* infallible tribunal, and its decision over him is necessarily supreme and inexorable. Not to obey it would be to be false equally to God and to himself. If it be not absolute right which he has reached, it stands in the place of absolute right for him; and only along its road, however thorny and steep and high, can he climb up toward heaven. Practically, then, we insist upon it, there is no infallibility possible to man but that which is resident in his own soul."

Yet when this same Protestant rationalism was grappling with doctrinal rationalism, it turned its back on its own reasoning and maintained that if this inner tribunal be ultimate, it must be able to discern the perfect truth and divinity of each and every part of the Bible. It must be able infallibly to distinguish the apocryphal from the canonical. It must be able to pronounce judgment concerning the genuineness, or at least the inspira-

tion, of the disputed books. It must be able to detect all interpolations of uninspired transcribers, and all deviations of the manuscripts from the original record.

Must it? Can not your trained Christian consciousness tell you anything unless it tell you everything? Does mathematical consciousness tell you everything in mathematics? Can not your mathematical consciousness be trained to the point of acquainting you with the fact that there are four fingers on each hand unless it tell you also how many bones and joints and muscles and corpuscles there are in those four fingers and what are their names? Must it tell you how the blood circulates and nourishes, colors and purifies itself? Must it tell you on what principle, in what method, that blood gathers itself from chyme and chyle, and lends to the nails their hardness and to the flesh its softness? Christian consciousness is only one phase of the universal consciousness. We might just as well say that the baby can not trust the multiplication table unless he can comprehend the calculus as to say that a man can not truly believe in the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins unless he understands with equal clearness the whirl of Ezekiel's wheels, wheel within wheel, the beryl stone, and the terrible crystal, for the spirit of the living creature was in the wheels!

Assume for a moment that the Christian consciousness does not give us assurance concerning the Divine authority and inspiration of the Scriptures; what does? The Church? The minister? The council? The assemblies? The bishops? Your Christian consciousness must give you assurance concerning *them!* The creed tells you what Paul means, but what tells you that you may trust the creed? The Church bids you trust the catechism, but your own Christian consciousness must answer for the Church. You take just as much responsibility by sitting in judgment on the Thirty-nine Articles

which interpret the Bible as you do by sitting in judgment on the Bible. You take as much responsibility in accepting the Apostles' Creed as you do in accepting the apostles. You perform the most momentous act of private judgment in relinquishing private judgment.

It is brought with great solemnity against Dr. Harper that he has plainly declared that the Christian student, after having found out just the language used by the authors of the various books of the Bible and the exact meaning of the language, must apply the final test of his own reason in determining what statements are true and what are to be rejected. To the plain question of one of his students, "Do you mean to say that if my reason condemns any Scriptural statement as untrue I must reject it?" his reply was: "Certainly; for what purpose was your reason given you?"

Whatever Dr. Harper may have said, it is forever true that not only has a man the right to reject what his reason contradicts, but he has not the power to do anything else. It is a psychological impossibility. No man can believe against his reason, because it is through his reason that he believes. To say that he must believe what his reason rejects is to say that he must believe what he can not believe. If a teacher—be his name John Baptist or John Smith—should say, "every child is born with six fingers on each hand," you could not believe him, because your reason tells you that four is the normal number. If the penalty for not believing were death at the stake, you might conceal your conviction; you might even put in your public confession of faith that there are six fingers on each hand; and if you were a scientific and conscientious man you would betimes discover that the elasticity of language permits you to call the thumb a finger, and the elasticity of science might permit you to discern somewhere under the skin a rudi-

mentary finger, suppressed by your environment in some past age, or to be developed by your environment in some future age, and so you might somehow creep along conscientiously with your six fingers till a learned linguist, mousing among old manuscript, should detect a clerical error, and announce that John's copyist had mistaken four for six, but that really it was in the original four fingers on each hand. Yet how much trouble would have been saved if in the beginning we had not worshiped the letter—had recognized the claims of reason and simply said there must be a mistake somewhere: our Christian consciousness is enough when it tells us that there are only four fingers on each hand!

This is where the orthodox play into the hands of the fool who saith in his heart, There is no God. Mind, I do not say the thoughtful—it may be sad, it may be weary—searcher for truth who confesses with more or less of pathos and patience, "I can not see God." I mean the blatant and boastful agnostic who never went ankle-deep in Scriptural or any other investigation, but who makes more noise shouting and splashing in the shoals than the whole Squadron of Evolution makes in sailing the wide seas over. His idea of argument is: Do you believe Joshua's sun stayed in the sky all night? Do you believe Lot's wife turned into a pillar of salt? Yes? Then you are an ignoramus. No? Then you must throw away the Bible or proclaim yourself a coward and a hypocrite.

The real scholars do neither. The men who are increasing the sum of the world's knowledge are studying, not scoffing, the Bible. President White, in the very exposition of the story of Lot's wife, has served well every department of study by the excellence of his method. The folly of anti-rationalism was never more clearly demonstrated than by his presentation of the grotesque

absurdities that clustered and flourished around Lot's wife in its absence. Our old friend Josephus has gently enlarged upon the sacred record in the supposition that "*continually* turning back to view the city as she went from it"—apparently thinking her punishment too severe for a single lapse—"and being too nicely inquisitive what would become of it, . . . was changed into a pillar of salt; for I have seen it, and it remains to this day?"

President White summons from the second century the great father, bishop, and martyr, Irenæus, who not only vouches for the biography, but countenances the belief that the soul of Lot's wife still lingered in the statue, giving it a sort of organic life. The Targum of Jerusalem not only testified that the salt pillar at Usdum was once Lot's wife, but declared that she must retain that form until the general resurrection. In the fifteenth century the friar Felix Fabri declared that he could not see the statue because he was too far off; "but we saw it with firm faith, because we believed Scripture, and we were full of wonder." And he gives a new touch in the information that Lot's wife had met her peculiar punishment because she had refused to add salt to the food of the angels when they visited her. Giraudet, a priest, clinched the whole matter by testifying to the point. He found her! She was "lying there, her back toward heaven, converted into a salt stone, for I touched her, scratched her, and put a piece of her into my mouth, and she tasted salt!"

If testimony never agreed, a theory was established for each fact. If pillars of salt were washed away, and new ones appeared in different places, it was because Lot's wife was walking about. If a small salt block accumulated near the statue, it was madam's pet dog also transformed into salt. If the statue were forty feet high, "there were giants in those days" to account for it. If

no statue were to be seen, Lot's wife was taking a salt-water bath in the Dead Sea. As early as the middle of the eighteenth century, however, we find a theory similar to the one that has been presented here—a suggestion that Lot's wife was caught in a shower of sulphur and saltpetre, which covered her and converted her into a pillar of salt. It is pleasant to see all the way along that the heart of humanity is sounder than its head, and that both Protestant and Catholic, though ready to pound all the world to pieces on the question of Lot's wife's body, were equally ready to admit that her soul was not eternally damned, Luther even going so far as to pronounce her a faithful and saintly woman.

The only point on which we should fundamentally disagree with President White is where he characterizes "statements which enlightened men throughout the world *know* to be mythical." *Know* is a far word, especially when it is four thousand years away, and while as yet the East has hardly more than begun to develop its hidden treasures of tablet and other testimony. The moral effect is just as strong if we say with him that the worst enemy of Christianity could wish nothing more than that its main leaders should insist that it can not be adopted save by those who accept as historical, statements which enlightened men throughout the world *hold* to be mythical.

Shall we now stand for a moment in the light of Joshua's sun? For three thousand years it never troubled us. If people thought at all about it, they thought God could as easily make the sun shine for two days as for one. They apparently looked at it like Ruskin: "What! surprised that the sun should stand still? Not a bit! I always expected it would! The miracle is in keeping it going!" But presently science began to stir, and astronomy began to adjust the universe and to discover

that everything in it would have to be turned upside down if the sun stood still, and the wiseacres and the penny-a-liners raised a loud cry that now the Bible must surely be thrown away, because Joshua was proved by science to be an arrant humbug!

Time rolled on, and people did not throw away their Bibles in spite of that unastronomical and unscientific sun. People are very apt not to throw away their Bibles, even when they are bidden. One day in the autumn of 1883 I was walking in the country alone, when I presently became aware of something extraordinary in the world—in the earth, and in the heavens. It was just sunset; the sun had gone down; it ought to be dusk, yet it was not dusk. It was so noticeable, so impressive, so persistently light and softly bright that I stood still fronting the west. The whole world was aglow. Over the round earth was a suffusing yellow light. High up, mounting almost to the zenith, a red sky reigned—a soft, red gold inexpressibly strange, beautiful, unnatural. You remember it. By the morning papers we learned that the wide earth was bathed in that wonderful sun-glow.

Science started out to investigate the red sunsets, all the newspapers struck in to lend a hand, and even orthodoxy itself reported that "a committee of the Royal Society of England, appointed to report upon these sunglows, connects them with the volcanic eruption of Krakatoa, which threw into the upper region of the atmosphere immense clouds of vitreous pumice-dust, or fine particles of glass. This material was projected into a stratum of the air from fourteen to twenty miles above the sea-level. The glows spoken of were caused by the reflection of this cloud of glass-like particles, and its great height caused the effect to continue much later in the evening than that which results from reflection of

particles in the lower strata of the atmosphere, and produces ordinary twilight.

"Upon searching the records for corresponding phenomena in the past, it is found that such after-glows are by no means infrequent. In 1831, when volcanic eruptions were especially numerous, there were times when the sky was brilliantly lighted at midnight, so that at Berlin and Genoa small print could be read when 'the sun must have been nineteen degrees below the horizon.'

"Close examination of the account of the miracle in Joshua does much to prepare the way for some such natural explanation of the events of that day as is suggested by the report of the Royal Society. Orthodox conservative commentators like Keil properly insist upon our observing that these verses (x, 12–15) are parenthetical—a quotation from the poetical Book of Jasher, in which the words of Joshua were first recorded.

"It is difficult to see how such a poetical description should have arisen without some basis in fact. This poetical quotation from the Book of Jasher is amply explained and accounted for by some such natural prolongation of daylight at that particular juncture as we have already witnessed more than once during the present century. Such an explanation of the account relieves it from the apparent incongruity of disarranging the whole mechanism of the heavens to bring about so small a result as the defeat of an army. Such an enormous disarrangement is out of harmony with the ordinary economy in the use of miracles as detailed in Bible history. But it is no small confirmation of the general accuracy of the Scripture narratives that so ready an explanation is at hand for the poetical description incorporated from the Book of Jasher into this remarkable account." And the style and spirit of it correspond exactly with those of the preceding verse. In the same flight which the pro-

longed sunlight made victorious to the Hebrews, fatal to the Amorites, the historian adds: "The Lord cast down great stones from heaven upon them, and they died." This is not cited as miracle. Why? Because the writer immediately adds: "They were more which died with hailstones than they whom the children of Israel slew with the sword." He chanced to duplicate his stones with hailstones, and a hailstone is not an uncommon occurrence. Even hail large enough to kill a man is known to experience [hail was falling in Baltimore at the very moment the Bible class were listening to this reading, in a storm which destroyed property and imperiled life]; but these volcanic sunsets we knew nothing about, and so we said Joshua's sun-glow is a miracle. If the sacred writer or the profane copyist had happened to leave those "hailstones" out and put in only "stones," that form of unfaith which recognizes itself as conservatism would not have allowed us to suggest that they were hailstones, because that would have been rationalism; that would have been sitting in judgment on the word of God; that would have been putting reason to judge revelation. But the Lord is said to have thrown the stones just as much as he stayed the sun. And he threw the stones as he often throws stones, which we call hail-stones. So, by parity of reason, he stayed the sun through natural processes.

But it is not for the most radical rationalists to plume themselves on their wider views, on their more advanced thought. There is nothing original in their interpretation, nothing that the world has not been well informed of. Their views have been held from time immemorial. Nothing can be more rational than the account of Josephus:

"The place is called Beth-horon, where he also understood that God assisted him, *which he declared by thun-*

*der and thunder-bolts, as also by the falling of hail larger than usual.* Moreover, it happened that the day was lengthened, that the night might not come on too soon and be an obstruction to the zeal of the Hebrews in pursuing their enemies. Now, that the day was lengthened at this time, and was longer than ordinary, is expressed in the books laid up in the temple." Mr. Whiston, Cambridge Professor of Mathematics in the early years of the present century, comments calmly: "Whether this lengthening of the day by the standing still of the sun and moon were physical and real, by the miraculous stoppage of the diurnal motion of the earth for about half a revolution, or whether only apparent, by aërial phosphori, or mock sun, affording sufficient light for Joshua's pursuit and complete victory (*which aërial phosphori in other shapes have been more than ordinarily common of late years*), can not now be determined; philosophers and astronomers will naturally incline to this latter hypothesis."

Neither science nor piety need lash themselves to fury over the explanations of literature. They are questions of literature. They are not questions of faith. Let the potsherd strive with the potsherds; that is the way of pottery. But the word of our God shall stand forever.

This lyric of Joshua is poetry, it is religion. it is rationalism. The poetry of it and the religion of it stood man in good stead for three thousand years; then science stepped forward and said it could not be. Astronomical law forbade it. But science stepped forward again and said it could be. Geological law ordained it. Science even showed *how* it could be. And so, besides the poetry of it, and besides the religion of it, and besides the science of it, we have, thanks to rationalism, an invaluable leaf saved out of that lost Book of Jasher, an invaluable page out of perished history, a glimpse of the sociology and

literature and natural phenomena of a vanished world. Throw away the Bible? No! If there were but one Bible on the earth, we should do well to mount guard over it with the whole United States army rather than lose it out of history even, not to say out of theology.

It is science itself which forbids us to pronounce too confidently against even the literal truthfulness of the Bible. Many things which might be given up to legend without impairing the moral value of the Holy Scripture, because God can be illustrated by a legend or a myth as well as by a fact, science and research seem to be basing upon a true historical foundation. The rationalist must be wary with his myths, for the Egyptian explorers are at his heels. Rationalism would not insist too strenuously upon the details of that beautiful Oriental romance, the history of Joseph, but neither may we be too strenuous in relegating it to romance. Its personages, its scenery, its incidents, are coming out in brick and stone, as well as in immemorial Scripture, to the light of the nineteenth century. Miss Edwards has told us of excavated cities whose buildings at the foundations have bricks made of coarse, scanty straw; higher up, these bricks are mixed with a rank weed, and at the top are composed only of the Nile mud. Through all these centuries the Bible alone has preserved those bricks without straw, to be unearthed by our spades.

Professor Sayce tells us that, a century before the exodus, active literary intercourse was going on between Babylon and Egypt and the smaller states of Palestine and Syria. Over the civilized East there must have been libraries and schools where the Babylonian language and literature were taught, because that tongue appears to have been as much the language of diplomacy and of cultivated society as the French is the language of Eu-

rope. Kirjath-Sepher, the name of the city which gave Joshua so much trouble that he offered his daughter as wife to the man who should take it, means Book-town, and it was the seat of a famous library. Its name was also Debir, meaning sanctuary, indicating that its books were stored in its chief temple, like the libraries of Assyria and Babylonia. These books were in the form of clay tablets inscribed with the cuneiform characters, as we learn from the archives of the palace of Amenophis III, just discovered. It is not impossible that those clay tablets may still exist under the soil, awaiting the spade that shall disclose to the nineteenth century the very books which the Canaanite scholars were reading and writing a hundred years before Othniel attacked their city, stimulated by his love for the beautiful Achsah, whose hand awaited the victor. In this, too, we have a glimpse of another of the many romances scattered along the Bible paths—the heartsome, human Bible paths—for Othniel was the son of Kenaz, Caleb's younger brother, and Caleb was the partner of Joshua, and co-leader with him in Israel, so that both young people were of distinguished family. Probably they had seen much of each other, and possibly it was a knowledge of the mutual attachment of the cousins which was in Caleb's confident mind when he announced his daughter as the prize of the victor. Very likely he knew the young man's mettle, and meant not so much to give a stimulus as an opportunity. The scheme was in any case brilliantly successful. The young man won a great victory and a great match. An admirable match it proved for the girl also, since Othniel was not only a skillful and successful general in war, but an able administrator in peace and an upright judge. When Israel cried unto the Lord in stress of anguish, the Spirit of the Lord came upon him, and he went out to war and prevailed, and came home and administered justice with

equity, and held the land tranquil and prosperous forty years, till Othniel slept with his fathers.

In a careful reading of these clay tablets just discovered in Egyptian palaces, many names and incidents are confirmed which have hitherto been met only in the Bible, thus restoring to history what we had ignorantly relegated to myth.

Mr. Harper, an artist who has traveled much in the Holy Land, is an accomplished Bible scholar, and has been for many years an active member of the Palestine Exploration Fund Committee. His general conclusion is that the statements of the Bible are being confirmed by modern discoveries in a remarkably full and exact manner. You may not ask too scoffingly whether the Assyrian came down like the wolf on the fold, and whether Hezekiah and his princes and his mighty men really did stop the waters of the fountains to keep him out. We have found the plug!

Sodom and Gomorrah, Mr. Harper believes, were destroyed by lightning. Joshua's delaying sun was due to refraction caused by the intense cold of, or connected with, the hail-storm; and declares the phenomenon not unknown in the present.

Rationalism can as easily lead to folly as the rabies against rationalism. Rationalistic fancy is as unscholarly as anti-rationalistic fact. The old Ebionites "explained" Paul's conversion by theorizing that he was a Greek who went up to Jerusalem, fell in love with the high priest's daughter, was refused, and in resentment set himself full against high priest, altar, law, Sabbath, and everything distinctively Jewish. And a new Ebionite, not evidently meaning to be profane, seriously suggests: "It seems evident, then, that upon emerging into manhood Jesus found himself in love. But with whom? Tradition does not tell us. Yet can we not see her? Is it not

always the same girl, forever reappearing, who attracts genius in its first longings for sympathy? It is easy to see the soft, appealing eyes, with more luster than steadiness; the face richer in forehead than in jaw and chin; the slight figure, full of a nameless grace, a tender charm, which would be perfect were it not for a certain indecision which lurks in every attitude. Alas! she is more truthful than candid; more gentle and complying than sympathetic; more self-denying than unselfish. . . . And yet how affectionate and winning! How tempting a rock for a man to split the powers of his mind and heart upon!"

This, which is no more rationalism than it is exegesis, simply shows the obtuse angle which folly may make in the rebound. We have a right to the romance of Othniel and Achsah, of Ruth and Boaz, of Esther and Ahasuerus. They are given. Such Ebionitish fictions, without perspective and without dignity, have no value beyond the quality of the thought which produced them. They do not dim the glory of true reasoning.

We who were born and bred in a New England village remember the big red Bible that always stood apart on a table by itself in the best chamber, in the guest chamber—a book which was sacred on week-days from childish meddlesome fingers, but was free on Sundays after church to best clothes and immaculate hands. Among the astonishing pictures in this Bible was the passage of the Israelites through the Red Sea. On each side the procession stood an even, high wall of water that looked like masonry, as solid as rock, with a dry, clean, smooth path under foot. Against that wall of water scientific skepticism threw itself in scorn, and did make some breaches therein; but by and by came Rationalism poking its fingers into geography, visited the Red Sea, and found out that at Suez there is a bar extending from

one shore to the other, which at times is now almost laid bare by a favorable conjunction of low tide and strong east wind. Upon either side of this bar the water is deep.

Does it not all stand explained? You who have been at Bar Harbor can see that a retreating army might get away from a pursuing army in Mount Desert by being at the bar at low tide and rushing across to Bar Island, while the returning high tide should keep the pursuing army on Mount Desert.

The Red Sea tide is an irregular one—not always to be depended upon for withdrawal. But it came to pass, in the course of nature, by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, that the frightened, fleeing Israelites found the bar so bared that they could cross it. By the course of Nature? Certainly. So the record says. The Lord caused the sea to go back by a strong east wind all night. That is nature, not miracle. That is the way the Red Sea bar is always bared. The Israelites came safely through between the deep waters on each side. The Egyptians plunged in after them, hot-headed; but before they had crossed, the waters began to flow down again—not miraculously, not falling upon them from a wall above their heads, but slowly rising beneath their feet; a rising tide, only muddy at first, so that they drove heavily, clogging their wheels, and even leaving them sticking fast in the mud. The water deepened, slowly rising, but always rising, so that the hot haste of pursuit had time to cool, and leaders took counsel and decided that it was too dangerous to attempt further passage against the threatening waters, and turned back and fled in panic—too late! too late!

> "The feet had hardly time to flee
> Before it brake against the knee,
> And all the world was in the sea."

Dr. Talmage asks: "Why not be frank, and say, 'I believe the Lord God Almighty came to the brink of the Red Sea, and with his right arm swung back the billows on the right side, and with his left arm swung back the billows on the left side, and the abashed water stood up hundreds of feet high, while through their glassy wall the sea-monsters gazed with affrighted eyes on the passing Israelites?'"

Because we do not believe it. Because the Bible does not say so. It was Moses who came to the brink of the Red Sea and swung his arms. That is like a man. The Lord God caused the sea to go back by a strong east wind all night. That is like God. Doubtless Dr. Talmage, with his irrepressible energy, would have made a much greater stirabout of the waters right and left than the Lord God made with his commonplace east wind; but, after all, the east wind is a good deal of a blow. Even Dr. Talmage can not belittle it, nor does exegesis require it. It is enough to say with Josephus:

"As for myself, I have delivered every part of this history as I have found it in the sacred books. Nor let any one wonder at the strangeness of the narration, if a way were discovered to those men of old time, who were free from the wickedness of the modern ages, whether it happened by the will of God or whether it happened of its own accord; while, for the sake of those that accompanied Alexander, king of Macedonia, who yet lived comparatively but a little while ago, the Pamphylian Sea retired and afforded them a passage through itself, when they had no other way to go; I mean, when it was the will of God to destroy the monarchy of the Persians. And this is confessed to be true by all that have written about the actions of Alexander. But as to these events let every one determine as he pleases."

This explanation of the devout Jew throws a flood

of light upon Moses. Callisthenes, kinsman and pupil of Aristotle who had been Alexander's tutor, who accompanied Alexander, and who naturally wished to make out as big a story as he could for his master, says the Pamphylian Sea did not only open a passage for Alexander, but, by rising and elevating its waters, did pay him homage as its king! But the rationalistic and philosophic Strabo, removed by three centuries from the temptation to flatter Alexander, explains that between the mountain and the sea there is a narrow passage along the shore, dry at low water, or in calm weather, so as to be passable by travelers, but when the sea is high it is overflowed. The mountain ascent being steep and winding, in still weather they use the coast road. But Alexander, who depended much upon his good fortune, came in the winter season, and rushed forward impetuously, without staying till the floods were abated, and marched his men through it a whole day up to the waist in water.

Arrian, not only a historian but a statesman and a soldier, combines piety and philosophy, though living in a day when Christians were accounted atheists: "When Alexander removed from Phaselis, he sent some part of his army over the mountains to Perga, which road the Thracians showed him. A difficult way it was, but short. However, he himself conducted those that were with him by the sea-shore. This road is impassable at any other time than when the north wind blows; but if the south wind prevail, there is no passing by the shore. Now at this time, after strong south winds, a north wind blew, and that not without the Divine Providence (as both he and they that were with him supposed), and afforded him an easy and a quick passage."

Appian also gives the modern Christian view. Comparing Cæsar and Alexander, he says: "They both depended upon their boldness and fortune as much as on

their skill in war. As an instance of which, Alexander journeyed over a country without water, in the heat of summer, to the oracle of (Jupiter) Hammon, and quickly passed over the bay of Pamphylia, when, by Divine Providence, the sea was cut off; thus Providence restraining the sea on his account, as it had sent him rain when he traveled over the desert."

Plutarch says: "His march through Pamphylia has afforded matter to many historians for pompous description, as if it was by the interposition of Heaven that the sea retired before Alexander, which at other times ran there with so strong a current that the breaker rocks at the foot of the mountain very seldom were left bare.

"Menander, in his pleasant way, refers to this pretended miracle in one of his comedies:

> 'How like great Alexander! do I seek
> A friend? Spontaneous he presents himself.
> Have I to march where seas indignant roll?
> The sea retires, and there I march.'

But Alexander himself, in his epistles, makes no miracle of it; he only says he 'marched from Phaselis by the way called Climax.'"

Langhorne, who stands sponsor for Plutarch, says: "Josephus refers to this passage of Alexander to gain the more credit among the Greeks and Romans to the passage of the Israelites through the Red Sea."

But Whiston, espousing the cause of Josephus, declares Plutarch's reflections entirely uncalled for: that all the more numerous original historians of Alexander gave the same account of the providential going back of the waters of the Pamphylian Sea, so that Josephus was not only justified in giving his narrative, but would not have been justified in withholding it. But as to these events, let us imitate the moderation of Josephus, and let every one determine as he pleases—meaning as he must.

Will you stand by the red Bible and the rock wall and be orthodox, or will you accept the Red Sea and the sand-bar and be a rationalist? Or will you accept the exegesis of the Arabs who pointed out to a member of this class the exact spot where the Israelites crossed?

"But is not the water very deep there?"

"Oh! yes. It is deepest there. But we wished to make the miracle as great as possible!"

Or will you interpret the red Bible by the Red Sea and be a rational orthodox Christian, thanking God for the light that has streamed down from those far-off days to us upon whom the ends of the earth are come?

These events—the destruction of the cities of the plain; the red sunsets of that memorable day which enabled the great general of the Hebrews to follow up his victory to the destruction as well as the rout of his foes; the emancipation of a panic-stricken nation of slaves by the overthrow of a powerful and splendid army, the flower of Egypt's wealth and pride and absolutism—these were great events. The fame of them overspread the ancient world. They were celebrated in song. They became imbedded in literature. Their state and splendor and grandeur, their wide and wild disaster, the height of their power, and the completeness of their wreck, compassed every note in the gamut of tragedy and made their story a song of the world's eternal possession. But it was religion that found the key, it was religion that tuned the lyre, it was religion that held the harmony through three thousand years of warring and waning discord, till now all the passion and pain are lulled to peace, and we blend our voices in what was the enduring inspiration of their song: "Glory to God in the highest!"

## CHAPTER III.

### THE KING OF SALEM.

Beloved, Sprite and Psyche, winged from some airier sphere than this and poising here in pain and darkness, longing for native light, of native love sore bereft—you, peering passionately into the abyss in search of your vanished sunbeam, question me why I can be so jubilant over the "oldest book in the world," when it shows that, before the days of Abraham, there was a system of morality comprising everything that Christ taught; and that those precepts, handed down traditionally, might have been given Christ, a boy, by any of the old wandering desert people inheriting them.

Verily, first, if incidentally, I exult, because through this I learn how closely the error of the dear past ages wraps us all around. I, rooted in Puritanism, Calvinism, St. Augustinism, by long ancestry and close training, may well be hide-bound with theological theory; but you, Sprite and Psyche—pure soul, pure heart, Flower o' the Peach, Flower o' the Sun—how came you to be meshed in men's devices, so that when you would soar toward native light your white wings may not stir?

Yet so it is. Of things as they are, of Christianity pure and simple, we scarcely hear. What we are chiefly taught is the opinions which many generations have formed about Christianity. When any part of these opinions is seen to be false, and begins to be reft away,

the cry is that Christianity lies bleeding—that another assault has been made upon it !

Whereas Christianity has not been in question. What Origen, or Augustine, or Leo Tenth, or Archbishop Whately, or Matthew Arnold, or Enoch Pond interpreted as Christianity may have been scrutinized, but the body of Divinity is unscathed.

In your question I read your unwritten creed : that the world lay in darkness outside of Christ and of the one moonglade that led back from him to the plains of Mamre and Ur of the Chaldees. Therefore, whatever shows moral light outside that narrow pathway tends to subvert the Christ.

Listen now, you who have read and heard so much, to the truth of history, and welcome Ptah-Hotep, because he confirms, in detail and from remote antiquity, a world-theory which reason imperiously frames, and which slight but clear historical glimpses in the Bible as imperiously necessitate.

Let us scan first the very earliest of the Bible glimpses, because we have known Melchizedek much longer than we have known Ptah-Hotep.

One of the most interesting and important of the great historic movements of humanity is the emigration of the celebrated Emir Abram. Yet it was but the march of a single sheik but a few hundred miles to the southwest.

The original motive of this migration is known to history and theology as the call of God to Abram. The best explanation concerning the nature of this call we get from the pulpit, which constantly teaches that we are called by God to missionary and other duty, just as Abram was. It follows as the night the day, that if we are called as Abram was, then Abram was called as we are. God spoke to Abram as God speaks to us. If he did not, if

there was any special divine appearance, any special verbal communication out of the spiritual heavens, then Abram's obedience has no moral lesson for us, and his career gives us no guidance. If Abram had a direct, unmistakable order from a higher power, he did not walk by faith but by knowledge. It is not faith which sees and hears God by the bodily senses; it is sight. Faith is the evidence of things *not* seen. We alone live by faith who have not seen and yet believe; and if we can not fully believe, think we are at least permitted to hope.

The testimony of the Bible justifies the teaching of the pulpit. The first narrative relates that "the Lord had said unto Abram, Get thee out of thy country [Haran], and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will show thee."

Stephen, in the bold, glowing, indignant speech which angered a hostile church to his violent death, says: "The God of glory appeared to our Father Abram when he was in Mesopotamia before he dwelt in Haran."

That this can not mean the literal call through the ear and appearance to the eye, the same ancient book teaches with great emphasis, declaring that no man can see God and live. And the latest of the Bible writers strengthens the statement: "No man hath seen God at any time. The only begotten Son which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him."

We are not, however, left to a negative. The original narrative, to which we have just as ready and free access as had Stephen, gives only a simple story of the migration of a family: "Terah took Abram his son, and Lot the son of Haran his son's son, and Sarai his daughter-in-law, his son Abram's wife; and they went forth with them from Ur of the Chaldees, to go into the land of Canaan; and they came unto Haran, and dwelt there."

There is no word or hint of any miraculous or unusual

appearance or call of God. It is precisely as one would say: Manasseh Cutler took his wife Mary and his son Temple, and Mary his daughter-in-law, and Grace his granddaughter, and went from Hamilton, in Essex County, to Marietta on the Muskingum, and beheld the land that it was fair. And just as Manasseh Cutler, if he had so willed, might have named the town which he founded Marietta, for his wife Mary, so may Terah, the fond and sorrowing father, have named the city of his new founding Haran, for the beloved son who died before his father in the land of his nativity, in Ur of the Chaldees; and the grief and desolation of whose untimely death may have been one of the ways in which God appeared to the bereaved father and brother, predisposing them to abandon their stricken home for the distraction of new scenes. Stephen's piety attributed the leadership to God, just as our pulpits would say that Mr. Cutler was led by God to the Ohio migration and settlement.

In the spirited and magnificent appeal of a poet of the same blood, of a later time, but still of a remote antiquity, the exact nature of Abram's call is even more distinctly implied: "Who raised up the righteous man from the East, called him to his foot, gave the nations before him, and made him rule over kings? . . . Who hath wrought and done it, calling the generations from the beginning? I, the Lord."

The call of Abram and the call of the generations are classed together as of one and the same kind.

Josephus's account of the nature of the call of God to Abraham, containing as it does a record of the gradual conception of the true God in Abraham's mind, is rational and most interesting after thousands of years of literal and forced interpretation. Abraham, says Josephus, was a person of great sagacity, both for understanding all things and persuading his hearers, and not mistaken in

his opinions; for which reason he began to have higher notions of virtue than others had, and he determined to renew and to change the opinion all men happened then to have concerning God; for he was the first that ventured to publish this notion that there was but one God, the Creator of the Universe; and that as to other [gods], if they contributed anything to the happiness of men, each of them afforded it only according to his appointment and not by his own power. This, his opinion, was derived from the irregular phenomena that were visible both at land and sea, as well as those that happen to the sun and moon and all the heavenly bodies. . . . For which doctrines, when the Chaldeans and other people of Mesopotamia raised a tumult against him, he thought fit to leave that country; and at the command and by the assistance of God he came and lived in the land of Canaan.

We may therefore believe that the appearance of God to Abraham was such as all may have who follow the Highest. God appeared to Abram at Mesopotamia in fraternal love and filial duty and sympathy, in family faith and steadfastness. Abram was called of God through the purity and piety of his character, through the energy of his nature, through the restlessness or adventurousness of his spirit, through the grace and glory of his ambition, through the irrepressible impulse and forecast of genius. The word of the Lord came to Abram just as the word of the Lord by night to the marching Pilgrims came. God said, "Get thee out of thy country," just as God said, "I am tired of kings," or rather it *may* have come in this way. There is nothing in the Bible which forbids such interpretation. It puts no strain upon words, either the words of Moses or the words of Emerson. We instinctively interpret it thus in reading Emerson, and there is no heterodoxy or heresy in so interpreting the

biographer of Abram. If our individual judgment were left as free in the one case as in the other, doubtless God would have spoken with the same voice in both.

The Bible writers were so saturated with the Divine Spirit, so filled with the Holy Ghost, that in all things they heard the voice and saw the will of God; just as Spencer and Huxley and Tyndall see everywhere the working of an energy which they dare not name. The world in the course of ages, at various times in various places, so lost this divine inspiration and illumination as not even to be able to understand it. The profound and intimate reverence of the Scriptural writers became "overset" into mechanical theories of sense and matter, coarse, clumsy, inelastic, and untenable. Men read "God spake," and began to explain how he spoke; and the people who did not accept their explanation were reckoned in the same category with men who do not believe that God exists. Not to believe that God speaks as Calvin, or Servetus, or Loyola, or Edward Everett Hale says he speaks, is not to believe in God.

The carelessness with which we teach the Bible is succinctly displayed in a single paragraph from the lips of a president of an educational institution:

"As God had taken pains to summon Abraham away from his idolatrous neighbors in Chaldea, and afterward to separate him from low-lived Lot, sending him forth childless to the promised land to secure an uncontaminated stock, so Abraham himself solemnly responded to the divine intention by keeping himself clear of all his idolatrous surroundings in Palestine, and seeking a wife for his son far away in his brother's home in Mesopotamia. . . .

"During his long life the patriarch repeatedly changed his residence."

How a pure stock could be secured by removing from

one contaminated district to another does not appear. Abraham did in Palestine what he could have done more easily in Chaldea—sought a wife for his son in his own family. It certainly was not necessary for them to emigrate in order to intermarry. They might all have remained comfortably at home in Chaldea.

Does not the whole philosophy of the removals lie in Abraham's nomadic character, and in his towering, aspiring genius for the apprehension of God? In repeatedly changing his residence, was he not simply acting after his kind? We can trace the purposes of God in history; but to do this accurately we must be heedful of facts. In this case the only true philosophy seems to lie in the unregarded final statement.

But the Bible writers laid the world no nearer to God than modern Science lays it to the inscrutable and omnipresent force which she ventures not to personify.

The migration of Abram was eminently successful. He prospered in substance, family, and fame. Bearing himself always with dignity, courtesy, magnanimity, and, generally, with truthfulness and honor, he secured the deference of his neighbors, the friendship of nobles, the comradeship of kings. When, in the vicissitudes of the day, it happened that his nephew was taken prisoner in war, Abram could arm servants enough of his own household to pursue the victorious kings, give battle, and effect a rescue.

It was upon his return from this brilliant exploit that an incident occurred, slight in itself, simple and natural, yet attaining a world-wide celebrity from its illustrative use in the Jewish church; a revelation to us of the unknown prehistoric world, but not, as has sometimes been supposed, a revelation of the unknown spiritual world.

And the "King of Sodom went out to meet Abram (after his return from the slaughter of Chedorlaomer and

of the kings that were with him) at the Valley of Shaveh, which is the king's dale. And Melchizedek, King of Salem, brought forth bread and wine; and he was the priest of the most high God. And he blessed him and said: 'Blessed be Abram of the most high God, possessor of heaven and earth; and blessed be the most high God which hath delivered thine enemies into thy hand.' And he gave him tithes of all."

It is simplicity and lucidity itself; yet so bent is human vision on seeing around a corner instead of looking along the straight lines of inexorable law that most of us fail to discern the light that shines through the narrative, in hereditary determination to discover a light that never was on sea or shore. Because Melchizedek was used among the Jewish writers to illustrate Christ, we insist that he was some mysterious and miraculous person, some being of a higher order than ours, sent from the spiritual heavens as an antetype of Christ, inexplicable, but perhaps, therefore, divine. One dear theologian I know who, driven from the external errors of her hereditary faith, step by step, clings to this divine and miraculous Melchizedek as her last fortification; and even you, Sprite and Psyche, Flower o' the Peach, Flower o' the Sun, who might be supposed never to have heard of Melchizedek in your garden of lilies and roses—even you say, sighing: "Christ was necessary as the renewing of the type of Melchizedek very likely," with the air of one who, under strong radical temptation, has made a conservative concession.

Flower o' the Sun, what have you to do with the type of Melchizedek? You are no Jew, bound to the horns of the altar! You may accept Christ or you may reject him; but if you reject him, it will not be because, like Paul's hearers, you cling to the Levitic priesthood and the burnt-offerings. You need no præ-Levitic type to

justify an extra-Levitic priesthood. Priesthood itself is a thing of the past!

The Epistle to the Hebrews is the armory whence we draw our weapons of mischief; but what does that epistle say?

The letter is accredited to Paul. In closeness of reasoning, in facility of illustration, in cleverness, courtesy, and tact, it is worthy of Paul; but we are not concerned as to who wrote it, only as to what it teaches.

The object of the writer was to dismiss and even to destroy forever the whole prevailing, active, firm-rooted theological system of the Jews whom he was addressing—altar, sacrifice, priesthood—and to substitute for it Christianity, the worship of God in spirit and in truth. He was a radical reformer, far more subversive than Luther, of the system in which he found himself; yet his methods singularly and suavely illustrate the truth of Christ: I am not come to destroy but to fulfill. This radical reformer, as wise as radical, instead of directly attacking what he wished to remove, adopted the truth which lay at the heart of it—the longing to approach God—and which had given it the vitality to endure for two thousand years, and this germ-truth he reclothed in the spiritual guise of the new day; not mechanically, from without, after man's way, but growth-wise, from within, God's way.

The Jewish nation was priest-ridden; but Paul, as we will call the writer for convenience, did not denounce the priesthood, but suggested that all priestly function had been transferred, once and forever, to Christ. Paul did not bid them stop the daily degradation of brutal and bloody sacrifices, but suggested that Christ made the sufficient sacrifice once for all when he offered up himself. The Levitic priests were many, because they were not suffered to continue by reason of death; but Christ,

through the power of an endless life, hath an unchangeable priesthood.

But there was the imperative Jewish law that a priest must be of the house of Levi. To meet this comes the full sweep and swing of the argument lifting the question above the level of Jewish ritual into the wide, clear heights of the universal world. David had given the indisputable key-note, and Paul took up the refrain and rang the new song loud, full, unerring, over the whole land of Judea and the far unlistening future: "A priest forever after the order of Melchizedek!"

What was the order of Melchizedek? It was no order at all. In that lay the whole point and pith of the illustration. In that lay all the quality which made him an antetype of Christ. The Jew believed that salvation was of the Jews, and that the salvation of the Jews was of the house of Levi. This Paul refuted by their own sacred Pentateuch, which declared Melchizedek a priest, and their own sacred psalms of the great king, which confirmed his priesthood; yet they knew that Melchizedek was not even a Hebrew, much less a Levite. He was outside the whole line of Hebrew blood, race, church traditions; he belonged to the world. He was cosmopolitan and not tribal. So far from belonging to the tribe of Levi, nobody knew to whom he belonged—Paul, his correspondents, David, Moses, no more than we. In genealogy, history, biography, he was without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days nor end of life. For the Jews, as for us, he stepped out of absolute darkness for one dazzling moment, robed in light, and immediately withdrew into the black unknown. But because that radiant moment revealed him a priest of the most high God, a priest of the most high God he abideth continually.

Furthermore, Paul clinches his argument to his He-

brew hearers, this priest, outside the line of Hebrew ties and appointments, attested a priest by Moses and by David, was greater than any Jewish priest, greater even than their great father and founder Abram. It was a hard doctrine to preach to the haughtiest and most exclusive people under the sun; yet Paul not only preached it, but proved it out of their own sacred annals. "Consider how great this man was," he says to his reluctant listeners, "unto whom even the patriarch Abraham gave the tenth of the spoils. The Levites take tithes of the people according to law; but this man, whose descent is not counted from the Levites, received tithes of Abraham, and blessed him; and, without all contradiction, the less is blessed of the better. Abram, who paid tithes, was less than Melchizedek, who received them. Melchizedek, who pronounced the blessing, was greater than Abram, who received it."

The argument for Christ and against the Levitic priesthood was, on Hebrew grounds, overwhelming. This one admitted fact of Jewish history—that there was a priesthood of God other and greater than the priesthood of Levi, that there had been a king of nations greater than their greatest leader, and as near to God—disposed forever of the Jewish claim that theirs was the only true religious worship, that their priesthood was all-adequate and exclusive, that their system was perfect and perpetual.

If the Jewish system were adequate and Christ superfluous, as the Hebrews argued, why, asked Paul, was there a priesthood of Melchizedek outside the Jewish system? He did not, nor do we, deny the special mission of the Jewish nation. It was to cradle the Messiah. It was to conserve the word of righteousness. That each nation has its special mission is a thought as old as Clement and Lactantius, probably as old as Ptah-Hotep's

ancients. But the special mission of the Jews was discharged in Christ. The word of righteousness was thenceforth to be upheld by the whole world.

What is Melchizedek to us? As a type of Christ, nothing. We have no faith in Urim and Thummim. We came out—no, we were never under—the bonds of the Jewish priesthood.

Yet for us, too, Melchizedek, priest of the most high God, opens wide the doors of the kingdom of heaven. That one moment of his emergence from the ancient unknown world, his face alight with God, his hands uplifted with blessing, floods the whole earth with the glory of the universal fatherhood. We long ago threw off the bonds of the Jewish law; but that iron-bound exclusiveness in which the Jews sought to cramp eternal righteousness has reappeared in a visible and fallible Christian Church seeking to bind the gospel of Christ to its own interpretations and ministrations, seeking to limit the fatherhood of God to a special association. But all the weakness and narrowness of vision which sees divine revelation flowing toward humanity only through the narrow channel, the one thread-like and often turbid rill of the Judean and the Christian theology, melts and disappears in the pure white glow of this heavenly beam. While Abram was yet a wanderer in a legendary past so far, so faint, that its tracery we hardly discern, its language we but little understand, we see another nation serving the most high God, a king who, in very name, is king of righteousness, king of peace.

There seems to be unfolded in this beautiful tradition a correspondence as significant as it is exquisite; so slight, so incidental, that it must be historical as well as poetical.

The defeated King of Sodom, whom Abram avenged and befriended, went out to meet him at the King's Dale.

The spot selected by the splendid, spoiled Absalom to rear a pillar to himself was also the King's Dale. Therefore it was probably near the capital city, Jerusalem the Golden; wherefore it seems probable that the King of Salem held his royal residence and his pure court at the very spot where afterward rose the Holy City of the world. Melchizedek, before history began, worshiping not the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, but the God of his own fathers, upon the Holy Mountain, left in his departing the blessing of his vanishing age upon the new time; blessed it and baptized it with his own name of righteousness and peace.

How many more such nations and such kings gave its strength of life to the ancient world we do not yet know; but here comes one from his burial of centuries, Ptah-Hotep, with his book in his hand, testifying, and to the satisfaction even of French skeptics, that in our night of the long ago, before Jew or Gentile had analyzed themselves out of the human race, God, the Creative Force, Absolute Being, Eternal Energy, had given man power and light to organize society. Ptah-Hotep stands before us from the ages preceding Abraham as clearly outlined, as firmly colored, as delicately shaded, as if Cabanal had drawn the picture yesterday—a calm, firm, generous, refined gentleman.

Ptah-Hotep reveals to us a society of scholars, teachers, artists, judges, police, farmers, sailors, pilots—the classifications of long-established social order. In his pages we see the well-conducted household—the father deserving and receiving the reverence of his children; the one wife tenderly loved and honored; children trained gently in obedience and knowledge; we see bad morals abhorred as death; law supreme; authority respected.

The Proverbs of Solomon and the Proverbs of Ptah-Hotep are from the same fountain of wisdom:

"He who is master of his own spirit is superior to him whom God has loaded with his gifts."

Act "as a steward of the goods belonging to God.

"Love thy people.

"Return a gentle answer.

"Forget the wrong.

"Be kind to all.

"Do not contemn or ridicule men even when wrong.

"Beware of pride, of hardness of heart, of oppressing others, of bad temper, of scandal, of libertinism."

Ptah-Hotep's theology is occasionally a little obscure, as if the clear image of the most high God were somewhat blurred. Nevertheless, with gods he recognizes one God. All that man has, he teaches, is the gift of God. All is held at the will of God. He believes in prayer, and accounts himself beloved of God, as Abram was called the friend of God. He holds that God's will toward men is that they should have life with peace; the same song which the angels sang over Bethlehem. God wars against the oppressor, and a pure morality alone can please him. A noble conception of a Supreme Being, a lofty code of ethics, a system of spiritual religion, we gather from the pages of this prince of Egypt before the Bible history of the Jewish or of the Christian religion began.

And be it observed that to Ptah-Hotep the world was as old as it is to us. He certifies that the law of true morality has been perfect from the earliest times, *because it is of divine origin*. It must, therefore, also remain unchanged. Himself as remote as the Pyramids, he yet appeals to the authority of the ancients. He fortifies his own position by showing that they, too, inculcate the study of wisdom, duty to parents, respect for property, charitableness, peaceableness, content, liberality, humility, chastity, sobriety, truthfulness, justice; that they, too, depre-

cate the wickedness and folly of disobedience, strife, arrogance, pride, slothfulness, intemperance, unchastity.

Thus Ptah-Hotep testifies with Melchizedek to the only satisfactory world-theory; not that the Jews were a chosen people, and all other peoples were rejected or neglected peoples; but that to all peoples God communicated the light of divine reason. In the beginning was the Word—the *Logos*, reason. The same code of morals that we strive to practice to-day the wisdom of old Egypt tried to enforce. What is virtue now and spiritual grace, filial duty and conjugal fidelity, was the same then. You, Sprite and Psyche, Flower o' the Peach, Flower o' the Sun, need not stay your light poise to show me that Christ might have learned this from the desert travelers. The main thing is that the desert travelers knew it. Melchizedek in sacred history and Ptah-Hotep in profane history open the door into their ancient world and reveal to us a realm of order and morality and true religion; men seeking God and finding him and living in his light and having joy and peace in believing. Anterior to Jewry, outside of Christianity, absolutely unconnected with either by visible ties, in the Bible and outside of the Bible, we see nationalities constructed, organized, and conducted in the fear and the worship of God.

Thus the continuity of faith spans the whole world from the unknown past to the unknown future with its bow of promise and of peace. Christ came into the world not to teach a new ethics, but to spiritualize and vitalize the old, to bring life and immortality to light, to authenticate and accomplish the *at-one-ment* of humanity with God by the authority of a divine personality and the power of an endless life.

## CHAPTER IV.

### THE INSTITUTES OF MOSES.

*An orthodox clergyman—old, blind, past work, as men phrase it—sat in his easy-chair by the winter fireside, walked under his elms beneath the summer sky, and scattered with full hands, everywhere, anywhere, seed-thoughts, some of which took root, sprang up, and bore fruit in the following exposition of the institutes of sacrifice.*

*If it were ever lawful to relinquish one's right of private judgment, this man of God would have been by divine right Pope. Blindness had only closed his eyes to trivial distractions, and released his well-equipped mind to clear vision. Apparently, absolutely, free from prejudice, seeking ever and only truth, he looked out upon the world of literature, of theology, of politics, through no distorting medium; and bringing to bear, upon all, the illumination of history, gave calm judgment, undismayed. Priest and poet and critic, apostle, prophet, president, passed before him in the pure white light of his reason, yielded up their secret to his tranquil gaze, and lived henceforth in a decision which was conclusive in the radiance of its own righteousness.*

*Wise in all large wisdoms, his only worldly wisdom was in relegating his personal welfare to the wise women by whom he was surrounded and infinitely cherished.*

*Reared under his tutelage, living in the sunshine of his rectitude, the reverence of the child but gathered volume and fixity as each crowded, succeeding year showed how rare were his qualities, how grand was their scope, how undisturbed their balance, how irreversible their decree.*

*While the Bible class were listening to these Mosaic readings,*

*which were his in their original suggestion, his in their mode of reasoning, and indebted to him for much of their illustration,*

"*Heaven, as at some festival,*
*Did open wide the gates of her high palace hall,*"

*and in that light he saw light.*

*To him, kinsman, teacher, lover, mentor, comrade,*
*To the Right Reverend and Most Reverend*
*JOHN PHELPS COWLES,*
*I dedicate these sacrificial chapters.*

EVERY sacrifice upon every altar, of first-fruits of the ground, or the first-born of animals or of human beings, in the Bible and out of the Bible, from the earliest recorded offering by Cain to the last path worn by the feet of animals led to slaughter at the still-standing altars of Pompeii—all is paganism.

This is not to say that it is evil and only evil continually. God accepts the right intent and the honest act, even though it be mistaken or imperfect. He established humanity in an order of development, and he can not be displeased with humanity because at any particular stage of its career it has reached only its appropriate degree of development and not the ultimate perfection.

The difference between Christianity and paganism is this: Christianity teaches that God is a spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth. Paganism teaches that God is a material, a conditioned being, to be worshiped with fruits and beasts and blood, with fire and wood and stone. The Bible is the record of man's rise, by the spirit of God working in him, from worship by wood and stone and burnt-offering, to Christ, in whom and through whom were destroyed forever all material sacrifice, and by whom was given the final spiritual interpretation toward which all literal sacrifice was slowly tending, that God is a spirit and is to be worshiped by becoming like him.

The Bible is not a revelation *from* God outward and downward *to* man. It is the story of the revelation of God *in* man forever upward. It is the story of man's spiritual evolution prefaced by a few lines—outlines—presenting his material evolution. All sorts of religion were in the world before the beginning and outside the limits of the Bible record—from worship by the gentle fruit-offerings of the gentle races to the fierce blood-offerings of the ferocious races. There were gods many and lords many. One might almost say every process had its god. There was the god of battles, the god of love, the god of storms, the god of disease, innumerable little gods of hearth and harvest, of all traffics, all amusements, and all emotions.

The Bible is the record, not of the first dawn of the idea of one God, for we know that idea had already not only dawned, but shone in Melchizedek and Ptah-Hotep; probably in many more. But it is the record of the only dawn of the supreme and holy unity that was strong enough and long enough, wide enough and warm enough, to glow into the perfect day, to reach down to our time, to embrace the whole world. To this idea—the idea of one God—doubtless many men, perhaps many races, had attained; but in the Jewish race alone it found staying quality—a stubborn, proud, tenacious race, whose very qualities of stubbornness and pride and tenacity made them clutch the idea and hold it as in a vise through dark ages of ignorance; and so the idea grew through battles and lapses, through bad and stupid kings, and vigilant, vigorous reformers, till the Jews delivered it once for all to the world in our Lord Jesus Christ, and perished forever as a nation, to live forever as a proof.

The Jews were chosen of God to receive and retain the Lord our righteousness, not by any miraculous call

of God to Abraham out of the skies, but by virtue of that natural hereditary and acquired force of character which we can describe but never explain—a force which specially adapted them to the mission of holding and propagating the faith. It is on the principle of the survival of the fittest. The election of God is the selection of Darwin.

The naturalist traces back along the lines of science the same principles which the scholar traces back along the lines of history.

For the divine authority of the Mosaic sacrifices we consult the Mosaic books, and we read :

"The Lord called unto Moses and spake unto him out of the tabernacle of the congregation, saying, If any man of you bring an offering unto the Lord, ye shall bring your offering of the cattle. And he shall put his hand upon the head of the burnt-offering, and it shall be accepted for him to make atonement for him. And he shall kill the bullock before the Lord, and the priests, Aaron's sons, shall bring the blood, and sprinkle the blood roundabout upon the altar. And he shall flay the burnt-offering, and cut it into his pieces. And the priests, Aaron's sons, shall lay the parts, the head and the fat, in order upon the wood that is on the fire which is upon the altar. But his inwards and his legs shall he wash in water ; and the priest shall burn all on the altar to be a burnt-sacrifice, an offering made by fire, of a sweet savor unto the Lord.

"And if the burnt-sacrifice for his offering to the Lord be of fowls, then he shall bring his offering of turtle-doves or of young pigeons. And the priest shall bring it unto the altar, and wring off his head and burn it on the altar, and the blood thereof shall be wrung out at the side of the altar. And he shall pluck away his crop with his feathers, and cast it beside the altar on the

east part, by the place of the ashes. And he shall cleave it with the wings thereof, and the priest shall burn it upon the altar; it is a burnt-sacrifice, an offering made by fire, of a sweet savor unto the Lord."

Is that like God? Like God who is a spirit? The unspeakable, ineffable, inconceivable spirit who is to be worshiped in spirit and in truth, did he ever order himself to be worshiped with the entrails of a bullock? Can he be pleased to smell the odor of burning fat? Would you be gratified to know that your daughter delighted to see a chicken's head wrung off and burnt before her eyes? And do you not agree with Whittier that nothing can be good in Him which evil is in me?

The internal evidence is against it. It is not like God. It is not gentle, gracious, seemly, harmonious. It is violent, brutal, bloody, barbarous. It is not spiritualizing; it is brutalizing. It is, therefore, against the eternal order. Therefore it can not be of God.

As an approach to God, it is retrogression. It puts in the background repentance for the remission of sins, and brings to the foreground the baptism of bullock's blood for the remission of sins. One word of repentance and reformation is given, to ten words of cattle and flour. In repeated instances there is expressed or implied assurance of forgiveness upon sacrifice being offered without the slightest reference to repentance. This sacrifice is called atonement—atonement for sin—and the understanding is distinctly conveyed that the sacrifice is all that is required, and is perfectly satisfactory to God. When you wish to please him it shall be by a sweet savor of burning flesh or it shall be by a meat-offering of fine flour and oil baked in the frying-pan.

"Thus shall Aaron come into the holy place: with a young bullock for a sin-offering, and a ram for a burnt-offering. And he shall take of the congregation of the

children of Israel two kids of the goats for a sin-offering. And Aaron shall cast lots upon the two goats, one lot for the Lord, and the other lot for the scape-goat. And the goat on which the lot fell to be the scape-goat, shall be presented alive before the Lord, to make an atonement with him, and to let him go for a scape-goat into the wilderness. Then shall he kill the goat of the sin-offering and bring his blood within the vail and sprinkle it upon the mercy-seat. And he shall make an atonement. And Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, putting them upon the head of the goat, and shall send him away by the hand of a fit man into the wilderness; and the goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities into a land not inhabited."

That is, the sin of a man shall be shouldered off upon an innocent beast. A bullock that has no knowledge of good and evil shall be killed to placate the Lord, who has been angered because a man who *has* knowledge of good and evil chooses the evil. A goat shall receive upon his head the sins of men and shall bear them away into the wilderness. The sinner is not commanded to repent and forsake his sin. His sin forsakes him—runs away on the head of a goat. The priest and the bullock and the goat make atonement. The man who committed the sin is but a passive spectator.

This is not the way of the Lord. It is the device of imperfect men. It is not raising man to the likeness of God; it is degrading God to the likeness of greedy and bloody men.

Rightly said the author of Genesis: "The Lord spake unto Moses out of the tabernacle of the congregation." It was not the word of the Lord out of the spiritual heavens where his honor dwelleth; but the word of the Lord as it came all blood-stained and distorted out of

the tabernacle of the congregation of brutal and bloody men.

The external evidence is against it. The best men, the most eloquent prophets, denounced the sacrifices of their priests with all the zeal and disgust of radical reformers the world over.

Samuel said: "Hath the Lord as great delight in burnt-offerings and sacrifices as in obeying the voice of the Lord? Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams."

David said: "Offer the sacrifices of righteousness and put your trust in the Lord. Sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire. Mine ears hast thou opened: burnt-offering and sin-offering hast thou not required. Thou desirest not sacrifice, else would I give it. Thou delightest not in burnt-offering. The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit."

Isaiah argued with the white heat of spiritual revolt against a false gospel preached from places of authority:

"To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me? saith the Lord. I am full of the burnt-offerings of rams, and the fat of fed beasts; and I delight not in the blood of bullocks, or of lambs, or of he-goats. Bring no more vain oblations; incense is an abomination unto me. When ye come to appear before me, who hath required this at your hands? Your hands are full of blood. Wash ye, make you clean, put away the evil of your doings; cease to do evil, learn to do well. Relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow."

Micah protested with an outburst of passionate reasoning: "Wherewith shall I come before the Lord? Shall I come before him with burnt-offerings, with calves of a year old? Will the Lord be pleased with thousands of rams, or with ten thousands of rivers of oil? Shall I give my first-born for my transgression, the fruit of my

body for the sin of my soul? He hath showed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee but to do justly and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?"

Modern science, modern culture, could not show more clearly the unreasonableness of it all; the grotesqueness, the inadequacy of animal and of human sacrifice. The whole body of divinity is in the final appeal to conscience.

The word of the Lord to Jeremiah was of the same import: "To what purpose cometh there to me incense from Sheba, and the sweet cane from a far country? Your burnt-offerings are not acceptable, nor your sacrifices sweet unto me."

With fierce sarcasm Amos pours out his contempt for the depravity and the devoutness of his countrymen:

"Hear this word, ye kine of Bashan which oppress the poor, which crush the needy. Come to Bethel and transgress; at Gilgal multiply transgression; and bring your sacrifices every morning and your tithes after three years, and offer a sacrifice of thanksgiving with leaven, and proclaim and publish the free offerings, for that liketh you, O ye children of Israel. Ye who turn judgment to wormwood, and leave off righteousness in the earth."

Then turning abruptly to direct denunciation: "I hate, I despise your feast-days. Though ye offer me burnt-offerings and your meat-offerings, I will not accept them, neither will I regard the peace-offerings of your fat beasts."

And then the eternal gospel: "Seek good and not evil, that ye may live; and so the Lord, the God of hosts, shall be with you. Hate the evil and love the good, and establish judgment in the gate."

Finally the worship of God by the slaughter of beasts had become so corrupt that the great preachers classed it

with the surrounding idolatries. The word of the Lord which came unto Zephaniah: "I will stretch out mine hand upon Judah and upon all the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and I will cut off the remnants of Baal from this place, and the names of the Chemarims with the priests. And them that worship the host of heaven upon the housetops, and them that worship and that swear by the Lord."

Undoubtedly these reformers—these Luthers of a constant reformation—did not all or always contemplate the overthrow of the institute of sacrifice. They desired and designed only its purification and vindication by a reform in conduct; but the sense of its inadequacy, and a perception of the true gospel of righteousness, underlie all their words and deeds, whose natural outcome was the destruction of the whole system. Emancipation was not the intent of the Government in our war of the rebellion, but lay wrapped in the first proclamation, as the fruit is wrapped in the seed.

But material sacrifices, it is argued, though not perfect or meant to be permanent, were divinely ordained as best adapted to a rude and barbarous people who had not arrived at any conception of a spiritual God and spiritual worship. Then why do *we* carry the gospel of Christ to barbarous peoples, and why do we not carry the gospel of burnt-offerings? The Apache Indians are a good deal more barbarous than were those countrymen of Moses and Micah. The Jews had as fine and forcible a literature as any in the world—a literature perhaps more pervasive and influential than another nation can show. The legislation of Moses may be ranked with that of Solon and the Twelve Tables, and the reputation of Moses as the great law-giver has suffered no eclipse. The songs of David are yet to be excelled in their sweep of imagination, in their depth of experience, in their wide and true

appeal to the human heart certified by their unparalleled popularity in undreamed-of countries through uncounted generations. No didactic teaching is better than that of Isaiah. No eloquence has a loftier tone, no genius has more solemn strains than are found in the Hebrew prophets.

If animal sacrifice be a proper way to prepare a rude people for spiritual worship, why did we not build altars in Hawaii? Why did we not sacrifice bullocks among the Cherokees? Why did we not burn the fat of fed beasts in Micronesia? Why do we not pour oil over flour for the Zulus? By as much as they are behind the Jews in civilization, by so much they need the preparation by the slaughter of beasts to make them ready to receive Christ.

Was it effective?

Did animal sacrifice prepare the way for the Lord? Did it make smooth the path for the Messiah? The sacrifices were in full blast when he was born a babe in Bethlehem, and that blast was turned upon him to destroy him. *Could* they have treated him worse? The very priests who performed the sacrifices, the very men who ministered at the altar, the very scribes and Pharisees who expounded the law of the sacrifices to the people, were the ones who hunted him to his death on the cross. Those who knew most about these preparatory institutes were the ones who were least prepared. They crushed and crucified the Christ for whom the sacrifices were to prepare them.

Pilate, the Romans, the idol-worshipers, the heathen, hesitated a little, tried to save him, had to be urged on to the crucifixion by those who worshiped the Most High God with burning fat and dripping blood.

Why did Isaiah ask: "To what purpose the multitude of your sacrifices to me?" He should have answered himself: "To prepare the minds of the people for the

great atonement of Christ." Isaiah's question has no pertinence if the sacrifices were preparatory.

But if the institutes of sacrifice were not a preparation for Christ, were they not divinely ordained as a type of Christ? The blood-atonement of sheep, though not really atonement, did prefigure the real atonement of Christ. The paschal lamb was a type of the Christ, the lamb slain from the foundation of the world. To this type Christ was antitype—to which in the fullness of time the type must give way.

But was this a successful device—so successful that it must have come directly from a divine hand, and not through the medium of human experiment? Twenty generations of innocent animals slaughtered by divine command in order to notify the world beforehand of the coming of our Lord, yet never conveying to the world one hint, so that when Christ did come, the very ones who administered the animal sacrifices knew nothing of their drift, their scope, their meaning, their notification! The officers of the type crucified the antitype. If God framed that device, it was a signal failure. But God never fails. Therefore the device was not of God.

The Old Testament may be searched in vain for any such meaning to sacrifices. Isaiah says expressly that they were of no use whatever, and that God was weary to bear them. If he had appointed them, why should he be weary to bear them?

If sacrifices were a type of Christ, there must be some resemblance. Wherein does it lie? Christ was a willing sacrifice; he offered himself. A bullock was forced to the slaughter for he knew not what. He was not even an intelligent sacrifice. He died like any beast at the shambles. He made the sanctuary of the Most High but a butcher's slaughter-house. There is no possible resemblance but innocence and death, and the innocence of the

beast is without knowledge of good and evil, and therefore of no significance, and the innocence of Christ is the innocence of supreme holiness. The involuntary death of an unwilling animal can not signify the voluntary death of him in whose hands are the issues of life.

Jesus himself must have known what was the worth, mission, type of animal sacrifices. He never spoke one word for them; all his words were against them. He never once spoke of their prefiguring value, their typical meaning. He never called himself the paschal lamb. He never called himself a sheep at all, but the Shepherd of the sheep. There is upon him no flavor of this typology.

To the law and to the testimony: what was the paschal lamb originally? For all that followed—the Sacrifice of the Lamb, the Passover, the Lord's Supper celebrated in our time, all lie in the original rite. What was the paschal lamb?

"The Lord spake unto Moses and Aaron in the land of Egypt, saying, Speak ye unto all the congregation of Israel, saying, In the tenth day of this month they shall take to them every man a lamb according to the house of their fathers, a lamb for an house; and if the household be too little for the lamb, let him and his neighbor next unto his house take it according to the number of the souls; and the whole assembly of the congregation of Israel shall kill it in the evening. And they shall take of the blood, and strike it on the two side-posts and on the upper door-post of the houses wherein they shall eat it. And they shall eat the flesh in that night, roast with fire, and unleavened bread; and with bitter herbs they shall eat it. And ye shall let nothing of it remain until the morning; and that which remaineth of it until the morning ye shall burn with fire. And thus shall ye eat it: with your loins girded, your shoes on your feet, and

your staff in your hand; and ye shall eat it in haste; it is the Lord's passover. And the blood shall be to you for a token upon the houses where ye are; and when I see the blood I will pass over you and the plague shall not be upon you to destroy you when I smite the land of Egypt. And this day shall be unto you for a memorial; and ye shall keep it a feast to the Lord throughout your generations; ye shall keep it a feast by an ordinance forever.

"And the children of Israel did as the Lord commanded Moses and Aaron. And it came to pass that at midnight the Lord smote all the first-born in the land of Egypt. And Pharaoh called for Moses and Aaron by night, and said, Rise up and get you forth. And the Egyptians were urgent upon the people that they might send them out of the land in haste; for they said, We be all dead men. And the people took their dough before it was leavened, their kneading-troughs being bound up in their clothes upon their shoulders. And they journeyed, and they baked unleavened cakes of the dough which they brought forth out of Egypt, for it was not leavened, because they were thrust out of Egypt and could not tarry."

What, then, was the passover? It was a simple meal, a family meal, a nourishing and strengthening meal; a hasty meal preparatory to a hard journey next day. The Israelites were, so to say, turned out of Egypt neck and heels. They ate, as it were, in traveling-dress, with their shawl-straps in their hands. Pharaoh was in such a hurry to get rid of them, and they were in such a hurry to be gone before he should get over his panic and change his mind, that they could not wait for the bread to rise. They swallowed their lamb and packed up the dough as it was, kneading-troughs and all, and ran.

There is no sacrifice in it at all. There is hardly solemnity. There is hurry and rush, but no confusion,

because they were well disciplined. To the Jews there was a meaning in celebrating it as a festival, for it meant a great deliverance, the emancipation of the Jews from four hundred and thirty years of slavery, and it memorialized even the method of emancipation ; but there is not a word of sacrifice. The slaughter was not pretended to be sacrifice. It was only that they had a hearty and relishing supper of roast lamb. It was a meal sensible and frugal, for if the family was small the next neighbor joined them in one lamb. Nothing was left for next day, for they would not be there next day. The cold victuals were to be burned—not left to decay, to make a stench and become a nuisance, even to their enemies and oppressors. Moses, their leader, looked closely after health, and therefore after cleanliness, and the burning was sanitary and not sacrificial.

The passover appears not to have been celebrated at all in the wilderness ; or in Canaan, so far as we know, till the time of Hezekiah. There is indeed color for the theory that the passover was not founded till long after the emancipation, though it was founded or fitted upon an incident of the emancipation. The establishment of a celebration of deliverance would be more in accord with the tranquillity and gratitude of a deliverance past than with the haste and stress of a deliverance yet to be achieved. But the traditions of the elders, whenever they began to build, builded so firmly and so liberally on the basis of history that when we get down to the times of Christ we find the sacrificial theory a component part, as it were, of the original institution. Josephus states as confidently as if it were holy writ that "when the fourteenth day was come and all were ready to depart, they offered the sacrifices and purified their houses with the blood. . . . Whence it is that we do still offer this sacrifice to this day and call this festival Pascha."

All the sacrificial element was lent to the slaughter, and all the purifying element to the blood, by later theory. It is not in the original narrative. The slaughter originally was of a lamb for food. The blood marked the houses that were to be passed over. Josephus spoke according as he had been taught, not as he had read for himself.

When our Lord celebrated the feast of the passover it was not as a sacrifice. There was no burning of fat on the altar, no blood-stain on the altar-horns, no blood poured out at the altar's base. "Then came the day of unleavened bread, when the passover must be killed. And he sent Peter and John, saying, Go and prepare us the passover, *that we may eat:* and they made ready the passover. And *as they were eating*, Jesus took bread and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body, which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me. And he took the cup and gave thanks and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood of the new testament which is shed for many for the remission of sins. Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you. Let not your heart be troubled."

There is love in it and sympathy, the eternal pain of human parting, and the infinite consolations of divine tenderness. It is as if Heaven opened wide her ever-during gates and poured forth once for all upon the suffering and sorrowing earth a flood of heavenly healing; gave, instead of despair for a vanished face and a silent voice, not hope of future meeting, but immediate eternal presence, eternal, instant reunion.

## CHAPTER V.

### THE ORIGIN OF SACRIFICE.

If the institutes of sacrifice were not ordered by God, whence did they come? If they were not divine ordinances, what were they?

Human ordinances instituted by man. Patient and minute investigation has found in man a native tendency to ascribe to a power above Nature everything in Nature which man can not understand or control. This is the first outflow of divine inspiration; the first faint breath of eternal life, constituting man alone, of all the animals, a living soul. If the phenomenon which he observes agrees with man's idea of the good and beautiful, he ascribes it to a good being. If it agrees with his sense of the hostile and the horrible, he ascribes it to a bad being. We can see this tendency in our own day. Captain Cook's sailors were hardly set for the first time on the Australian shore when they came rushing back to their boats crying that they had seen the devil in the bush! Thus they named the kangaroo.

This tendency marks a certain stage of development —the development in humanity of a spiritual nature. It is suggested in the Bible Genesis that the human race existed, whether for years or for ages, before it attained the knowledge of good and evil. Whenever humanity had attained that knowledge, by that knowledge it became capable of morality, and therefore morally responsi-

ble. When humanity could lift itself out of Nature and view itself in its relations, could abstract, classify, organize, and pass moral judgment on moral actions, its very first inference seems to have been that there was an unknown superior power outside of and above itself. Men saw that when they had done everything which they could do, the issue was still uncertain. Therefore there must be a power behind unseen. This power we call the powers of Nature. We may have a glimpse of it in the Garden of Eden, where they heard the voice of the Lord God walking in the garden in the cool of the day. A marginal reference substitutes the word *wind* for *the cool of the day*. They heard the voice of the Lord God in the wind.

Pope alludes to it:

> "Lo! the poor Indian, whose untutored mind
> Sees God in clouds and hears him in the wind."

We have reasoned a few steps further. We have discovered that many things which seemed to our ancestors supernatural are really natural. What ignorance had located outside of Nature, knowledge has relegated to Nature. But we have not advanced one step if we maintain that because God works by law, in law, through law, he does not work at all. The ancients misunderstood order and worshiped God, but better and truer so than to worship order and deny God.

This unknown power they individualized infinitely, and slavishly, because ignorantly, deprecated and conciliated it. They worshiped the god of fate to secure his help. They worshiped the god of disaster to avert his wrath. We can hardly call this morality, but it was a basis of morality. It may have existed a long while before it developed a sense of moral right and wrong, but out of it has sprung a sense of right and wrong. This power, which we have not dethroned when we call it the

power of Nature, became to the ancients living and personal.

As great men seemed to partake of the unknown power, they, too, came to be worshiped as gods. If Napoleon had lived twenty centuries earlier, he would doubtless have been apotheosized, for genius is spasmodic in its appearance, not hereditary. It has not been accounted for, nor has it been common enough to make familiarity serve the purpose of comprehension. It was therefore mysterious.

We are not without eye-witness. We ourselves have barely emerged from the god-making era. The Cæsars are as well known to us as George Washington, but they had their cult. Frescoes represented them taking their place among the gods. The "deified Cæsar" was as common a term to the Romans as "the late emperor" is to us. To the "deified Cæsars" temples were built, priests were appointed, sacrifices offered. I think the Cæsars knew better. Augustus Cæsar, perhaps the best of them all, showed a strong flavor of skepticism, but he availed himself of the popular belief in deities to fasten his institutions on the state. Tiberius, generally considered, though I think wrongly, the worst of them all, wrought in a sad sincerity, and refused to be deified. "I know well," he protested, "that I am but a man, and subject to all the conditions of humanity." But for many a day the thrones of heaven were recruited from the palaces of earth.

Naturally these earth-born gods carried with them into their heaven the qualities of earth. So Agamemnon's treasures were buried with him; so the dead hand of the Indian was furnished for the next world with the weapons which he had needed in this. As men required food for sustenance here, they carried this need into the unknown, and hence offerings of food and drink were

made to them as gods. Burnt-offerings may have represented cooked food; libations of wine sprang hence, and possibly the sprinkling of blood, for the drinking of blood among men was not unknown as a symbol of victory.

When the divine aspiration in man began to reach out into worship by offerings, into worship by slaughter of beasts, we do not know. It was not in the Garden of Eden. It did not appear outside of Eden till after a "process of time." Possibly the story of Cain and Abel epitomizes the first institution of animal sacrifice, the departure from the peaceful and harmless fruit-offering of the elder brother, or the earlier race, Cain, to the bloody and violent beast-offering of the younger brother, or the later race, Abel. It is true that the representative of fruit-offering has fared badly at the hands of the world, but it must be remembered that he was on the losing side. The beast-worshipers prevailed. The beast-worshipers told the story and had it all their own way. We have not yet heard Cain's side.

Josephus unhesitatingly explains the acceptance of Abel's sacrifice and the non-acceptance of Cain's by assuming that "God was more delighted when he was honored with what grew naturally of its own accord than he was with the invention of a covetous man, and gotten by forcing the ground!"

If Cain forced the ground more than Josephus forced this reasoning, he merited that his sacrifice should be rejected. We should naturally suppose that the one who took the most pains would give the most pleasure.

St. John gives a more reasonable explanation: "Cain was of the Evil One, and slew his brother. And wherefore slew he him? Because his own works were evil and his brother's righteous." It does not appear, however, that John was giving any more than his own inference,

or the traditional Jewish teaching. He was using the incident in a literary sense; as a rhetorical intensification, not a question of historical investigation; not apparently of divine inspiration. It was a tradition common to the Jews, the generalization of Josephus's specification. Indeed, the hard measure dealt out to Cain by his Jewish kin generally savors more of prejudice than of impartial history. "He accepted his punishment," Josephus declares, "not in order to amendment, but to increase his wickedness. He aimed only at his own bodily pleasures, though it injured his neighbor. He gained wealth by rapine and violence. He became a great leader of men to robbery. He was the author of weights and measures; and whereas," says his naïve biographer, "men lived innocently and generously while they knew nothing of such arts, he changed the world into cunning craftiness. He, first of all, set boundaries about lands; he built a city and fortified it with walls, and he compelled his family to come together to it. His posterity became exceedingly wicked, every one successively dying one after another, more wicked than the former. They were intolerable in war, vehement in robberies, if not murderous, profligate, bold in acting unjustly and in doing injuries for gain."

But none the less does Josephus account for the great age of the antediluvians by the theory that "God gave them length of days on account of their virtue!" And with Josephus's grave general charges of crime we mark that his specifications are all of the weights and measures and metes of civilization, the organization of society, the establishment of homes. Even in the story of Cain's victorious antagonist, the inspiration of the Almighty giveth us understanding of a man who, in defeat and exile, kept communion with God, received his protection, and became the progenitor of a race distinguished

for its agricultural, industrial, mechanical, and musical genius—that is, for the arts, the charms, the victories of peace, not of blood. What Josephus calls "cunning craftiness" seems to have been an Edisonian inventiveness. It is impossible to believe that the story of the first murderer means nothing but the first murder.

Abel perished, but it was in the beginning as it is now, and ever shall be—the blood of the martyrs is the seed of the Church. God rebuked Cain for bloodshed, even though it were to prevent bloodshed—the blood of a man for the blood of a beast—and the church of blood-atonement was established. But almost coeval with its establishment was the undying protest against it; first against its abuses, finally against itself. Its temptations to corruption were overwhelming. The reservation of a large part of the animal sacrifice to the priest was in itself a constant temptation, and brought great scandal both in the worship of idols and in the beastly worship of God. The original institutes of Moses ordained that "the priest that offereth any man's burnt-offering, even the priest shall have to himself the skin of the burnt-offering which he hath offered. And all the meat-offering that is baked in the oven, and all that is dressed in the frying-pan, and in the pan, shall be the priest's that offereth it. And every meat-offering, mingled with oil, and dry, shall all the sons of Aaron have, one as much as another. And this is the law of the sacrifice of peace-offerings, which he shall offer unto the Lord. If he offer it for a thanksgiving, then he shall offer with the sacrifice of thanksgiving unleavened cakes mingled with oil, and unleavened wafers anointed with oil, and cakes mingled with oil, of fine flour, fried. Besides the cakes, he shall offer for his offering leavened bread with the sacrifice of thanksgiving of his peace-offerings. And of it he shall offer one out of the whole oblation for a heave-

offering unto the Lord, and it shall be the priest's that sprinkleth the blood of the peace-offerings.

"And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel, saying, He that offereth the sacrifice of his peace-offerings unto the Lord shall bring his oblation unto the Lord of the sacrifice of his peace-offerings. His own hands shall bring the offerings of the Lord made by fire, the fat with the breast; it shall he bring, that the breast may be waved for a wave-offering before the Lord. And the priest shall burn the fat upon the altar: but the breast shall be Aaron's and his sons'. And the right shoulder shall ye give unto the priest for a heave-offering of the sacrifices of your peace-offerings. He among the sons of Aaron that offereth the blood of the peace-offerings, and the fat, shall have the right shoulder for his part. For the wave breast and the heave shoulder have I taken of the children of Israel from off the sacrifices of their peace-offerings, and have given them unto Aaron the priest and unto his sons by a statute forever from among the children of Israel."

A detailed account of the manner in which the priests imposed upon the people in idol worship is found in the story of Bel and the Dragon, cut off from the Book of Daniel. It is a story of the country from which Abram came, where his ancestors lived and worshiped just such gods.

"Now the Babylonians had an idol called Bel, and there were spent upon him every day twelve great measures of fine flour and forty sheep and six vessels of wine. And the king worshiped it and went daily to adore it: but Daniel worshiped his own God. And the king said unto him, Why dost not thou worship Bel? Who answered and said, Because I may not worship idols made with hands, but the living God, who hath created the heaven and the earth, and hath sovereignty over all flesh.

"Then said the king unto him, Thinkest thou not that Bel is a living god? Seest thou not how much he eateth and drinketh every day?

"Then Daniel smiled and said, O king, be not deceived: for this is but clay within and brass without, and did never eat or drink anything.

"So the king was wroth and called for his priests and said unto them, If ye tell me not who this is that devoureth these expenses, ye shall die. But if ye can certify me that Bel devoureth them, then Daniel shall die: for he hath spoken blasphemy against Bel. And Daniel said unto the king, Let it be according to thy word. Now the priests of Bel were threescore and ten, besides their wives and children. And the king went with Daniel into the temple of Bel. So Bel's priests said, Lo, we go out: but thou, O king, set on the meat, and make ready the wine, and shut the door fast, and seal it with thine own signet; and to-morrow when thou comest in, if thou findest not that Bel hath eaten up all, we will suffer death, or else Daniel, that speaketh falsely against us.

"And they little regarded it, for under the table they had made a privy entrance, whereby they entered in continually and consumed those things.

"So when they were gone forth the king set meats before Bel. Now Daniel had commanded his servants to bring ashes, and those they strewed throughout all the temple in the presence of the king alone: then went they out, and shut the door, and sealed it with the king's signet, and so departed.

"Now in the night came the priests with their wives and children, as they were wont to do, and did eat and drink up all.

"In the morning, betime, the king arose, and Daniel with him. And the king said, Daniel, are the seals whole? And he said, Yea, O king, they be whole. And

as soon as he had opened the door the king looked upon the table and cried with a loud voice, Great art thou, O Bel, and with thee is no deceit at all!

"Then laughed Daniel, and held the king that he should not go in, and said, Behold now the pavement, and mark well whose footsteps are these. And the king said, I see the footsteps of men, women, and children. And then the king was angry, and took the priests with their wives and children, who shewed him the privy doors, where they came in and consumed such things as were upon the table.

"Therefore the king slew them and delivered Bel into Daniel's power, who destroyed him and his temple.

"And in that same place there was a great dragon, which they of Babylon worshiped. And the king said unto Daniel, Wilt thou also say that this is of brass? lo, he liveth, he eateth and drinketh; thou canst not say that he is no living god: therefore worship him.

"Then said Daniel unto the king, I will worship the Lord my God, for he is the living God. But give me leave, O king, and I shall slay this dragon without sword or staff. The king said, I give thee leave.

"Then Daniel took pitch, and fat, and hair, and did seethe them together, and made lumps thereof: this he put in the dragon's mouth, and so the dragon burst in sunder: and Daniel said, Lo, these are the gods ye worship.

"When they of Babylon heard that they took great indignation, and conspired against the king, saying, The king is become a Jew, and he hath destroyed Bel, he hath slain the dragon, and put the priests to death."

The story may be a narrative of history, or a myth, or a legend, or a poem; but equally it indicates the source, character, and corruption of the institution.

The worship of the Israelites presents corresponding

abuses—abuses for which their blood sacrifices presented special temptations.

"The sons of Eli were sons of Belial; they knew not the Lord. And the priest's custom with the people was, that, when any man offered sacrifices, the priest's servant came, while the flesh was in seething, with a flesh-hook of three teeth in his hand; and he struck it into the pan, or kettle, or caldron, or pot; all that the flesh-hook brought up the priest took for himself. So they did in Shiloh unto all the Israelites that came thither. Also before they burnt the fat the priest's servant came and said to the man that sacrificed, Give flesh to roast for the priest; for he will not have sodden flesh of thee, but raw. And if any man said unto him, Let them not fail to burn the fat presently, and then take as much as thy soul desireth; then he would answer him, Nay; but thou shalt give it me now: and if not, I will take it by force.

"Wherefore the sin of the young men was very great before the Lord, for men abhorred the offering of the Lord."

Malachi paints an equal degeneracy: "A son honoreth his father, and a servant his master: if then I be a father, where is mine honor? and if I be a master, where is my fear? saith the Lord of hosts unto you, O priests, that despise my name. And ye say, Wherein have we despised thy name? Ye offer polluted bread upon mine altar; and ye say, Wherein have we polluted thee? In that ye say, The table of the Lord is contemptible. And if ye offer the blind for sacrifice, is it not evil? and if ye offer the lame and sick, is it not evil? offer it now unto thy governor; will he be pleased with thee, or accept thy person? saith the Lord of hosts. And now, I pray you, beseech God that he will be gracious unto us: this hath been by your means: will he regard your persons?

saith the Lord of hosts. Who is there even among you that would shut the doors for nought ? neither do ye kindle fire on mine altar for nought. I have no pleasure in you, saith the Lord of hosts, neither will I accept an offering at your hand. But ye have profaned it, in that ye say, The table of the Lord is polluted ; and the fruit thereof, even his meat, is contemptible. Ye said also, Behold, what a weariness is it ! and ye have snuffed at it, saith the Lord of hosts ; and ye brought that which was torn, and the lame, and the sick ; thus ye brought an offering : should I accept this of your hand ? saith the Lord. But cursed be the deceiver, which hath in his flock a male, and voweth, and sacrificeth unto the Lord a corrupt thing : for I am a great King, saith the Lord of hosts, and my name is dreadful among the heathen."

Moreover, the early outreach of man to God reveals a frank commercial element.

Undoubtedly there was an instinctive spiritual groping to find God, but there was as undoubtedly a very material *quid pro quo*. We may call it the early development of a sense of justice as between God and man, but in common talk it was a business contract. It was fair play or no play. When God met Jacob at Bethel, Jacob drove a palpable bargain. "If God will be with me and will keep me in this way that I go and will give me bread to eat and raiment to put on so that I come again to my father's house in peace, *then* shall the Lord be my God."

When the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah that Israel was punished because they worshiped other gods, men and women rose up and protested that they had kept the contract and that it was the Lord who had failed ; and I do not remember that men were ever quite so bold and outspoken in their idolatry as here—where they had the women to back them !

"Then all the men which knew that their wives had burned incense unto other gods, and all the women that stood by, a great multitude, even all the people that dwelt in the land of Egypt, in Pathros, answered Jeremiah, saying:

"As for the word that thou hast spoken unto us in the name of the Lord, we will not hearken unto thee. But we will certainly do whatsoever thing goeth forth out of our own mouth, to burn incense unto the queen of heaven, and to pour out drink-offerings unto her, as we have done, we, and our fathers, our kings, and our princes, in the cities of Judah, and in the streets of Jerusalem: for then had we plenty of victuals, and were well, and saw no evil. But since we left off to burn incense to the queen of heaven, and to pour out drink-offerings unto her, we have wanted all things, and have been consumed by the sword and by the famine. And when we burned incense to the queen of heaven, and poured out drink-offerings unto her, did we make her cakes to worship her, and pour out drink-offerings unto her, without our men?

"Then Jeremiah said unto all the people, to the men, and to the women, and to all the people which had given him that answer, saying, The incense that ye burned in the cities of Judah, and in the streets of Jerusalem, ye and your fathers, your kings and your princes, and the people of the land, did not the Lord remember them, and came it not into his mind? So that the Lord could no longer bear, because of the evil of your doings, and because of the abominations which ye have committed; therefore is your land a desolation, and an astonishment, and a curse, without an inhabitant, as at this day. Because ye have burned incense, and because ye have sinned against the Lord, and have not obeyed the voice of the Lord, nor walked in his law, nor in his statutes,

nor in his testimonies; therefore this evil is happened unto you, as at this day.

"Moreover, Jeremiah said unto all the people, and to all the women, Hear the word of the Lord, all Judah that are in the land of Egypt:

"Thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel, saying: Ye and your wives have both spoken with your mouths, and fulfilled with your hand, saying, We will surely perform our vows that we have vowed, to burn incense to the queen of heaven, and to pour out drink-offerings unto her: ye *will* surely accomplish your vows, and surely perform your vows"—will you?

"Therefore hear ye the word of the Lord, all Judah that dwell in the land of Egypt: Behold, I have sworn by my great name, saith the Lord, that my name shall no more be named in the mouth of any man of Judah in all the land of Egypt, saying, The Lord God liveth. Behold, I will watch over them for evil, and not for good: and all the men of Judah that are in the land of Egypt shall be consumed by the sword and by the famine, until there be an end of them. Yet a small number that escape the sword shall return out of the land of Egypt into the land of Judah; and all the remnant of Judah, that are gone into the land of Egypt to sojourn there, shall know whose words shall stand, mine, or theirs."

Cicero testifies that the worship of the gods had come to be by rites. The gods would protect them so long as they punctiliously performed the ceremonies. It was not a question of dogmas or doctrines, but of the merest formalism, of offerings and libations, of priests and ceremonies, of give and take.

The worst corruption of all was the desecration, the destruction of human life to placate the Creator of life. Of its origin we have no account; of its abolition, or of the origin of its authoritative, final, and permanent

abolition, it is possible that we have an account in the Bible.

Witchcraft seemed to be in mid-career throughout the world in the last part of the seventeenth century, and, like a brook in a smooth channel, flowed on tranquil because unopposed. But in New England the spirit of freedom was astir. Massachusetts began to question. Salem, at the heart's core of Massachusetts, began to question, and they put out the fires, and they took down the gallows, and they built the heavy weights into stone walls, and never any more after that time was a witch molested here. But my poor old Massachusetts and my poor old Salem are remembered not honorably, as they should be, for standing up fronting the world and forbidding the witch to be hanged, but dishonorably, because their opposition made them conspicuous and the iniquity of the last hangings centered on them. The world noted that the hanging was on their soil, and did not note that it was they who made these hangings to be the last!

So the horror of human sacrifice is sometimes concentrated on the offering up of Isaac, without observing that it may be signalized because it was final and not because it was pious. Never is human sacrifice even assumed to be ordained of God in the Bible after that one sacrifice of Isaac; and that is a sacrifice forbidden. And just as the witchcraft delusion was questioned, resisted, denounced by Rev. Mr. Hale, of Beverly, after his own wife had been accused, though he was passive if not active in it before, so it may be that Abram had looked unopposing upon the religion of human sacrifice until his own son was involved, and then the father's tenderness sharpened the man's wits, and the voice of God in his soul reversed the order of blood forever for his whole nation.

And thus indeed he made good his reputation that was to be, as a person of great sagacity, and not mistaken

in his opinions. Thus manifested he his higher notions of virtue than others had, and thus he continued, in his new home as in his old, to change men's opinion about God, as Josephus said; not only proclaiming the unity of God, the creator, but his righteousness and the sacredness of human life which partakes of the divine. To a world that worshiped with human sacrifice, Abraham preached that God was not to be worshiped with human sacrifice.

The Mosaic institutes were orderly, healthy, and chiefly decorous. They treated human sacrifice as a desecration and a horror. They were always against cruelty and oppression except of beasts for sacrifice. The Hebrews had bloody rites; but while all the surrounding nations worshiped many gods, they worshiped one God. They were continually going astray after false gods, but as continually coming back to the one God.

It is easy then to see that idol worship and beast worship of God were easily corruptible and often corrupted. But the corruption of a principle or a practice does not invalidate its original sincerity. Undoubtedly the original institutes of idolatry and the Mosaic institutes of animal worship were honest. They were the pathetic efforts of men feeling after God if haply they might find him. It was the device of the heart of man—a very rude and savage heart, but an aspiring heart—which God accepted in its aspiration and answered with ever-increasing spirituality in the sincere worshiper. The good Lord pardon every one that prepareth his heart to seek God, though he be not cleansed according to the purification of the sanctuary!

So the definite spiritual idea of one God and a righteous God was constantly, with increasing clearness, shaping itself in the Jewish mind, even through this material idea and practice of worship. Far back there arose, like a solid mountain peak out of surrounding fog, a purer

doctrine about God and divine things, gained volume and strength through the long ages, drew to itself all the good and wise men from whose moral kindred it sprang at the beginning, until at length it was taught with absolute authority, because with absolute truth, that God, a spirit, must be worshiped spiritually ; and that as with human parents, so with the divine, although the ill desert of wrong-doing can never be expiated or abated in the least degree, yet the wrong-doing itself can be freely and fully forgiven upon honest repentance, because such repentance restores the law-breaker to duty and to peace, and the law itself—the law of love, the only law—to its true place, its rightful honor, and its due observance. Appearing first in protest against the abuse of sacrifices, entwining itself with ridicule of the heathen worship of many gods and with reverent delineation of the true God whom alone Israel was taught to worship, it rose in the times of the prophets to a forecast of the abolition of all sacrifices.

With what vigor of logic and vivacity of rhetoric does Isaiah inveigh against the absurdity of idol worship !

"Is there a God besides me ? yea, there is no God ; I know not any.

"They that make a graven image are all of them vanity ; and their delectable things shall not profit ; and they are their own witnesses ; they see not, nor know ; that they may be ashamed.

"Who hath formed a god, or molten a graven image, that is profitable for nothing ? Behold, all his fellows shall be ashamed ; and the workmen, they are of men : let them all be gathered together, let them stand up ; yet they shall fear, and they shall be ashamed together. The smith with the tongs both worketh in the coals, and fashioneth it with hammers, and worketh it with the strength of his arms : yea, he is hungry, and his strength faileth : he drinketh no water, and is faint. The carpenter stretcheth

out his rule; he marketh it out with a line; he fitteth it with planes, and he marketh it out with the compass, and maketh it after the figure of a man, according to the beauty of a man; that it may remain in the house. He heweth him down cedars, and taketh the cypress and the oak, which he strengtheneth for himself among the trees of the forest: he planteth an ash, and the rain doth nourish it.

"Then shall it be for a man to burn: for he will take thereof and warm himself; yea, he kindleth it, and baketh bread; yea, he maketh a god, and worshipeth it; he maketh it a graven image, and falleth down thereto. He burneth part thereof in the fire; with part thereof he eateth flesh; he roasteth roast, and is satisfied: yea, he warmeth himself, and saith, Aha, I am warm, I have seen the fire: and the residue thereof he maketh a god, even his graven image: he falleth down unto it, and worshipeth it, and prayeth unto it, and saith, Deliver me; for thou art my god.

"They have not known nor understood: for he hath shut their eyes, that they can not see; and their hearts, that they can not understand. And none considereth in his heart, neither is there knowledge nor understanding to say, I have burned part of it in the fire; yea, also I have baked bread upon the coals thereof; I have roasted flesh, and eaten it: and shall I make the residue thereof an abomination? shall I fall down to the stock of a tree?"

Against the complaint of foreigners, that the God of Israel hideth himself, how earnestly he preaches the divine omnipresence!

"For thus saith the Lord that created the heavens; God himself that formed the earth and made it; he hath established it, he created it not in vain, he formed it to be inhabited: I am the Lord, and there is none else. I have not spoken in secret, in a dark place of the earth: I

said not unto the seed of Jacob, Seek ye me in vain: I the Lord speak righteousness, I declare things that are right."

With what scorn of idolatry, beginning almost with a jeer, he compares these made-up, helpless wooden images with the great I Am!

"Bel boweth down, Nebo stoopeth; their idols were upon the beasts, and upon the cattle: your carriages were heavy laden; they are a burden to the weary beast. They stoop, they bow down together; they could not deliver the burden, but themselves are gone into captivity. And even to your old age I am he; and even to hoar hairs will I carry you: I have made, and I will bear; even I will carry, and will deliver you. To whom will ye liken me, and make me equal, and compare me, that we may be like? They lavish gold out of the bag, and weigh silver in the balance, and hire a goldsmith; and he maketh it a god: they fall down, yea, they worship. They bear him upon the shoulder, they carry him, and set him in his place, and he standeth; from his place shall he not remove: yea, one shall cry unto him, yet can he not answer, nor save him out of his trouble.

"Remember this, and show yourselves men: bring it again to mind, O ye transgressors. Remember the former things of old: for I am God, and there is none else; I am God, and there is none like me."

Neither astronomy nor metaphysics nor mechanics can lend any touch of greatness to the absolute force, in whose worship the whole institute of sacrifice is shriveled to nothingness under the prophet's inspired portrayal.

"O Zion, that bringest good tidings, get thee up into the high mountain: O Jerusalem, that bringest good tidings, lift up thy voice with strength; lift it up, be not afraid; say unto the cities of Judah, Behold your God!

"Who hath measured the waters in the hollow of his

hand, and meted out heaven with the span, and comprehended the dust of the earth in a measure, and weighed the mountains in scales, and the hills in a balance? Who hath directed the Spirit of the Lord, or being his counselor hath taught him? With whom took he counsel, and who instructed him, and taught him in the path of judgment, and taught him knowledge, and showed to him the way of understanding?

"Behold, the nations are as a drop of a bucket, and are counted as the small dust of the balance: behold, he taketh up the isles as a very little thing. And Lebanon is not sufficient to burn, nor the beasts thereof sufficient for a burnt-offering. All nations before him are as nothing; and they are counted to him less than nothing, and vanity.

"To whom then will ye liken God? or what likeness will ye compare unto him? The workman melteth a graven image, and the goldsmith spreadeth it over with gold, and casteth silver chains.

"He that is so impoverished that he hath no oblation chooseth a tree that will not rot; he seeketh unto him a cunning workman to prepare a graven image that shall not be moved.

"Have ye not known? have ye not heard? hath it not been told you from the beginning? have ye not understood from the foundations of the earth? It is he that sitteth upon the circle of the earth, and the inhabitants thereof are as grasshoppers; that stretcheth out the heavens as a curtain, and spreadeth them out as a tent to dwell in. To whom then will ye liken me, or shall I be equal? saith the Holy One. Lift up your eyes on high, and behold who hath created these things, that bringeth out their host by number: he calleth them all by names, by the greatness of his might, for that he is strong in power; not one faileth.

"Hast thou not known? hast thou not heard, that the everlasting God, the Lord, the Creator of the ends of the earth, fainteth not, neither is weary? there is no searching of his understanding."

In comparing the ordinances of Moses with the obligations of morality, the prophets go hard to destroy the ordinances altogether.

"Is it such a fast that I have chosen?" cries Isaiah, impersonating the Lord, "a day for a man to afflict his soul? is it to bow down his head as a bulrush, and to spread sackcloth and ashes under him? wilt thou call this a fast, and an acceptable day to the Lord? Is not this the fast that I have chosen? to loose the bands of wickedness, to undo the heavy burdens, and to let the oppressed go free, and that ye break every yoke? Is it not to deal thy bread to the hungry, and that thou bring the poor that are cast out to thy house? when thou seest the naked, that thou cover him; and that thou hide not thyself from thine own flesh?"

Amos protests even more forcibly: "I hate, I despise your feast days, and I will not smell in your solemn assemblies. Though ye offer me burnt-offerings and your meat-offerings, I will not accept them; neither will I regard the peace-offerings of your fat beasts. Take thou away from me the noise of thy songs; for I will not hear the melody of thy viols. But let judgment run down as waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream. Have ye offered unto me sacrifices and offerings in the wilderness forty years, O house of Israel? But ye have borne the tabernacle of your Moloch and Chiun your images, the star of your god, which ye made to yourselves."

Jeremiah utters a flat denial of the Mosaic authority: "Thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel: Put your burnt-offerings unto your sacrifices, and eat flesh. For I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them

in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt-offerings or sacrifices. But this thing commanded I them, saying, Obey my voice and ye shall be my people, and walk ye in all the ways that I have commanded you."

The prayer of Manasses might have been offered by Professor Park but for one archaic word :

"O Lord, Almighty God of our fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and of their righteous seed ; who hast made heaven and earth with all the ornament thereof ; who hast bound the sea by the word of thy commandment ; who hast shut up the deep, and sealed it by thy terrible and glorious name ; whom all men fear, and tremble before thy power ; for the majesty of thy glory can not be borne, and thine angry threatening toward sinners is importable ; but thy merciful promise is unmeasurable and unsearchable ; for thou art the Most High Lord, of great compassion, long-suffering, very merciful, and repentest of the evils of men. Thou, O Lord, according to thy great goodness hast promised repentance and forgiveness to them that have sinned against thee : and of thine infinite mercies hast appointed repentance unto sinners that they may be saved. Thou therefore, O Lord, that art the God of the just, hast not appointed repentance to the just, as to Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, which have not sinned against thee ; but thou hast appointed repentance unto me that am a sinner : for I have sinned above the number of the sands of the sea. My transgressions, O Lord, are multiplied : my transgressions are multiplied, and I am not worthy to behold and see the height of heaven for the multitude of mine iniquities. I am bowed down with many iron bands, that I can not lift up mine head, neither have any release : for I have provoked thy wrath, and done evil before thee : I did not thy will, neither kept I thy com-

mandments; I have set up abominations, and have multiplied offenses. Now, therefore, I bow the knee of mine heart, beseeching thee of grace. I have sinned, O Lord, I have sinned, and I acknowledge my iniquities: wherefore I humbly beseech thee, forgive me, O Lord, forgive me, and destroy me not with mine iniquities. Be not angry with me forever, by reserving evil for me; neither condemn me into the lower parts of the earth. For thou art the God, even the God of them that repent; and in me thou wilt show all thy goodness: for thou wilt save me, that am unworthy, according to thy great mercy. Therefore I will praise thee forever all the days of my life: for all the powers of the heavens do praise thee, and thine is the glory for ever and ever. Amen."

With an ever-increasing spirituality in the leaders, and an ever-diminishing bloodshed among the people, came at length the total extinction of the sacrifices themselves—in Jesus Christ—the cessation of organic offerings to an inorganic Deity.

Does that seem a small thing?

The world was, apparently, never more strongly intrenched in the worship of idols and in the idolatrous worship of God than on the day when the babe was born in Bethlehem. Cæsar Augustus, endowed with a genius for pacification and organization, joined the gods of the conquered peoples to the gods of Rome, and, setting new gods of the Cæsars on the thrones of heaven, compacted the temporal power and the spiritual power, welded politics and religion into a system which held the world in thrall—but in a peace, too, that promised to make the thrall permanent.

But the babe in the manger was stronger than Cæsar with his Pantheons. Under the truth which fell from Christ's lips, that great and splendid community of gods crumbled and vanished away forever.

Forever, too, with idolatry, vanished the idolatrous worship of God. When the legions of Titus fell upon Jerusalem, the fires were still burning, though more faintly, upon her altars; the temple was still standing, though in paling splendor. Of that temple was left not one stone upon another, and the sacred flame was extinguished, never to be rekindled. If that devout and pious Jew, Sir Moses Montefiore, had been able to carry out his patriotic purpose and restore the holy city to its ancient glory, still not one drop of wanton blood would pollute the worship of God. Religion in this free country is free, but the life of lamb and goat and turtle-dove is safe from sacred slaughter; for not a Jew of all the sons of Abraham would revive the rite of blood-atonement. So far, at least, Christ was successful. The whole Western world ceased to preach the baptism of blood sacrifice for expiation, but everywhere was preached the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins. And the world has gone forward in the path upward, till, if King Hezekiah's great reform were started in Washington, with his thousand bullocks and ten thousand sheep, he would instantly be arrested for cruelty to animals.

Renan considers the most important part of the history of Judaism to be the complete transformation of Jahveh, the national god of the Jews, from a merely local and provincial to a universal deity. After having been looked upon as one petty god among others, he came during this period to be accepted by the Jews as one Supreme Creator, and, in the popular conception, a just God, which he had not been before; thus the introduction of the element of morality into religion was accomplished.

I have not myself been able to see anywhere in the Old Testament that the God of the Jews was ever held up to them by their religious teachers as local or unjust.

He seems to me always to have been preached as the one supreme God and as a just God, representing the highest Hebrew ideal of justice, and in this lay the difference between their theology and that taught by the other nations. I am delighted to find my Bible-reading confirmed by the learned Baethgen. After an exhaustive investigation, he maintains that the religions of the other Semitic peoples were polytheistic in character, while Israel's religion was officially monotheistic, and as such differed essentially from all those of cognate races—from all those of the Syrians, Arabs, Ethiopians, Moabites, Phœnicians, who surrounded the Jews, and by whom their religious ideas could have been influenced. He quotes with minute examination the song of Deborah, which is accounted the oldest or one of the oldest documents of the Pentateuch, and he shows that the principal differentiating thoughts of Israel's religion are in this song. He examines the word Elohim, and shows it to be like many other words plural in form, but not indicating plurality of meaning. He finds nothing to warrant the idea that Jehovah was only a national god and not the supreme God.

But, in support of our view that God is the God of all nations, the help of all nations, and not of the Jews alone, he does find that, while the Jews were so advanced in their theory of one God that he frankly admits with Kittel, another German critic, that he can not account for it except on a theory of special personal revelation, he sees in all the polytheism of the Semitic races a trend toward monotheism.

God was leading them, also, but in slower ways, to a knowledge of himself. As we saw Melchizedek and Ptah-Hotep feeling after and finding the God of righteousness, so down to the very last ages before Christ we see the pagan world ever and anon in their great men rising to

the height of divine things with true inspiration; as Syrus teaching the Romans to—

"Listen to thy conscience; it will punish even where there is no law.

"He who loses honor has nothing more to lose.

"To command one's self is the noblest empire.

"Keep thy word even to an enemy.

"It is better to *receive* an injury than to *do* one.

"Forgive others often; thyself never.

"God looks to see if the hands are pure; not if they are full.

"The extreme justice is almost always an extreme injustice.

"Discuss all that thou hearest; prove all that thou believest."

And Clement of Alexandria distinctly recognizes the voice of God in what he as well as we called the heathen world: "Perchance, too, philosophy was given to the Greeks directly and primarily till the Lord should call the Greeks. So, then, the barbarian and Hellenic philosophy has torn off a fragment of eternal truth.

"For the knowledge of God these utterances [written by Plato, Socrates, Xenophon, Cleanthes, the Pythagoreans] through the inspiration of God may suffice."

Pythagoras and Ovid were inspired of God to utter the law of the conservation of force: "All things change; nothing perishes."

Thus through thought and character we see men advancing slowly to a belief in one righteous God and to a knowledge of his will and ways. But the Jews had it in the beginning. Whence did they get it? They slowly advanced from the cessation of human sacrifices, through the gradual diminution of animal sacrifices, to their abolition. By the time of Christ the existence of one supreme God was so confirmed in the Jewish mind that they

never again fell into idolatry, even while all the world outside of them was still not only worshiping many gods, but making new ones. I can not understand it except on the theory that there is a God who knew in the beginning that man whom he had made could get on just so fast and just so far of himself. In art, in society, in organization, man seems to have been able to develop of himself from his impulse originally implanted.

In spiritual growth he was feeble, feebly reaching up toward God, falling constantly into the same pit—idolatry—whether he were a savage Hottentot, an æsthetic Greek, or a Roman citizen. It was, therefore, not by a late rectification of a mistake, but in the divine plan from the beginning, to endow a special race with special traits, fitting it to receive, in ways we do not understand, a special, limited, yet large and accurate idea of God, which should grow in that race, and through that race be delivered to the world in the person of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

History, recorded in the Bible, and science, investigating outside the Bible, agree that the way by which humanity approached God is a way of development. Therefore it is the divine way. In that sense God ordained sacrifice, and in no other. He placed man in the world with a moral nature and a spiritual nature capable of being developed. The story of their development is minutely told in the Bible by Moses and the prophets—told outside the Bible by Herbert Spencer and the naturalists. It is God leading man step by step—each step a little higher, a little nearer to himself—from a conception of a being a little stronger than man to our conception of a being beyond finite conception. What other way is there? Can a being just above a brute conceive of our God? And will not our conception of God increase with increasing knowledge till it is as much beyond the pres-

ent idea as the present idea is beyond the idea of the Patagonian?

If God, as seems necessary to believe, gave an extraordinary impulse to Israel in knowledge of himself, it was only in two respects—that he was one, the only God, and that he was a righteous God. As regards all else, their ideas were as crude as those of the neighboring peoples; and to retain that idea, to prevent its constant degradation to the worship of wood and stone, their leaders were forced to forbid all indulgence in art. The whole æsthetic nature of the nation had to be repressed that its religious nature might not be hindered. The sense for beauty, as Matthew Arnold would say, had to be sacrificed to the sense for righteousness. The Hebrews were forbidden to paint a picture or to make a statue, because all around them pictures and statues were inextricably interwoven with, consecrated to, the idea of many gods—of wicked gods—and would necessarily take their minds off from the elevating idea of a spiritual God.

Modern research has revealed to us Egypt full of paintings, statues, idolatry. Four hundred years of slavery had familiarized even the ignorant with the art of that ancient civilization. But their great leader had lived at the court of the king, and knew every form of luxury and vice and effeminacy that had fastened upon the worship of many gods, and had changed the statue, which may have been at first a mere representation and symbolism of the deity, into the deity itself. Fresh from the statues and the paintings which research is now revealing to us, Moses, as soon as he got his people well away from them, made his prohibitory law: "Thou shalt not make unto thee ANY graven image or ANY likeness of anything."

The agnostic says, looking upon this development in man of the idea of God: "God did not make man—man

made God"; and reasons thence that there is no God. I say: man conceived God, therefore God made man. Nature from the first protoplasm has been rushing forward to the production of a creature capable of reasoning, loving, hating, changing; capable of receiving the world from nature, and working it up and molding it into new forms, combining forces into new forces and assuming new features; capable of reaching out beyond this world and discovering facts and laws of the universe; capable of reaching out beyond the material universe, and framing from the moral and spiritual laws of his own world the conception of a spiritual universe with a supreme reason, a supreme love. Along the same line of reasoning by which I know only this planet surrounded by its few round disks and its few shining spots, but infer, and fully believe in and accept by faith, a great universe of worlds beyond sight and sound and reach; so, knowing only such realities of the spiritual, invisible universe as love and reason, acting in this world, but acting so strongly that they dominate the world, I infer, and by faith accept, an invisible spiritual universe with a supreme Creator—the divine, infinite reason whose name is Love.

## CHAPTER VI.

### THE NEW TESTAMENT SOLVENT OF THE OLD TESTAMENT SACRIFICES.

THE attitude of Christ and the apostles toward all the Mosaic institutes, wherein the ordinance of sacrifice is imbedded, was one of liberal conservatism, occasionally of cordial indignation, generally of moderation and charity. They seldom denounced, but they always supplanted. When the man was cured of leprosy, Christ recommended him to go and offer the gift that Moses commanded ; but we can readily see that the customary and legal certification of the cure was at the moment of paramount importance.

When his hungry disciples, walking through the cornfields, began to pluck the corn and eat it, the Pharisees accused them of breaking the law of Moses. He might have refuted them with the law of Moses, for Moses had expressly said that a hungry man might pluck the corn though he might not put a sickle to it. He did not do this, however, but made it an occasion to declare his own supremacy over the Mosaic law. He did not pull down the temple and the altar, but preached God above them both. He did not denounce the Mosaic law, but proclaimed that love—not slain beasts—*love* is the fulfilling of the law.

"The first of all the commandments is, The Lord our God is one Lord : And thou shalt love the Lord thy

God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength: this is the first commandment. And the second is like, namely, this: Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. There is none other commandment greater than these. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets."

And the law-ridden, sacrifice-burdened scribe was so struck with the beauty, the simplicity of this new law, that he gave instant assent: "Well, Master, thou hast said the truth: for there *is* one God; and there is none other than he: And to love him with all the heart, and with all the understanding, and with all the soul, and with all the strength, and to love his neighbor as himself, *is* more than all whole burnt-offerings and sacrifices.

"And when Jesus saw that he answered discreetly, he said unto him, Thou art not far from the kingdom of God."

In the very same chapter in which he, as it were, indorses Moses and the prophets, he also, as it were, abolishes them: "The law and the prophets were until John; since that time the kingdom of God is preached." When the famished people pleaded that Moses gave their fathers bread from heaven to eat, and *therefore* they believed on him, Christ met them with a broad denial: "Verily Moses gave you *not* that bread from heaven. My Father giveth you the true bread from heaven. *I* am the bread of life. I am the living bread which came down from heaven"; and when, in these word-battles, he confounded the sticklers for orthodoxy—Jewish orthodoxy—and touched the living, vital truths underlying all perishable forms, his adversaries were ashamed, and all the people rejoiced for all the glorious things that were done by him, for there is always in the heart of humanity a sensibility to truth, a recognition of truth, a leaping up to truth, which makes good man's claim to the divine nature, which is the truth itself.

To the people he was kind, pitiful, comforting, sustaining, sympathetic, excusing. His sarcasm, indignation, denunciation, were poured out upon the teachers, the preachers—scribes and Pharisees, who insisted on the letter of the law and disregarded its spirit, although even they had in the course of generations greatly mitigated its bloodiest features, so truly had the divine vitality of righteousness worked out the peaceable fruits of righteousness. Always Christ's attitude was of respect toward the sincere believer, of loathing and denunciation toward the hypocritical professor and false teacher. He held the Mosaic law, including the sacrifices, as a real though imperfect act of religion, to be destroyed by fulfilling its central and ultimate idea—love. He would destroy its ritual by diffusing its spirit. The statue is the fulfilling of the mold. The statue perfected, the use of the mold is served and the mold is broken.

When once and again, under the stinging lash of our Lord, all the oxen, sheep, and doves, candidates then present for sacrifice, fled or fluttered out of the courts of the temple at Jerusalem, they carried with them for all time, before as well as after, and for all places, within as well as without the temple, his universal and absolute condemnation of any and all animal sacrifices to such a being as the invisible incorporeal Deity. That stern lash of the mildest of men and the most daring of reformers wrote on each of those destined victims, scored or scared by it, his own personal and final excuse from the altar and the sacrificial knife, together with a full discharge of altars and sacrificial knives from henceforth forever. But this was not the whole lesson. The lesson of that lash and those words, was retrospective, as well as present and prospective. Governed by the same reasons, stimulated by the same motives, sanctified by the same high, moral purpose, that lash furnished for the

ages to come an authoritative certificate to the following effect, namely: It meant that the whole Jewish sacrificial code, the law and the practice under it, were absolutely without divine authority. The only alternative was, and was thus pronounced to be, that the said code was altogether of man.

It puts our Lord in square internecine conflict with the whole sacrificial system of the Jews, with Exodus and Leviticus, but it places him in perfect accord with Isaiah and Micah and many a psalmist. Those victims fled not so much because he bade their owners take them away, though he did that also, as because he himself drove them away. Further, he must have driven all those sacrificial birds and beasts away from the altar and out of the court, assuredly not because he was at cross-purposes with a genuine appointment of God, but exactly for the opposite reason, namely, because he was altogether at one with the will of the Father, who therefore had never authorized such sacrifices. For the use of human prayer and real worship Christ cleared the ground of those inattentive, unappreciative, and incapable four-foots and fledglings; not because the times had then just outgrown a certain form of worship, rude and primitive indeed, yet for the times valid and valuable, but because the thing referred to—namely, animal sacrifice—was form, and form only, invalid, and worse than valueless, without expression or implication of divine worthiness at all; but the exact contrary. Because animal sacrifices were not made for God, not fit for God, not worthy of God, but the very opposite, because animal sacrifices were made for idols. Just as in the Sermon on the Mount our Lord had perfected other precepts of the decalogue, lifting at once whatever he touched into the true moral atmosphere, he would supply what was lacking in the second, forbidding not only animal sacrifices

to idols, but the transfer of such sacrifices to Jehovah; for plainly animal sacrifices could not raise the idol to God's level, but to worship God just as the idol was worshiped might and did bring God down to the level of the idol, degrading him and debasing his pretended worshipers.

It is hardly possible to overrate and overstate the import of this narrative. Far more likely is it that we underrate the import of Christ's words and deeds. No man ever said more in little than he. He could compress volumes in a word, and more than all volumes in one passion. The occasion under notice was a passover, the nation's great anniversary. It was the annual pan-Jewish reunion; the *élite* of Jewry, all influential Jewry, was there. All had come up to Jerusalem to worship; that is, to offer sacrifices after the traditions of the Fathers. The sacrificial code required sacrifices in great numbers. This requirement constituted a demand. The demand created a corresponding supply. The man from Cyrene could not bring his calf or lamb with him; he expected to buy it on the spot. The man of Bethlehem was aware of the demand, and had the supply prepared to meet it. Supply must meet the demand at the time and place of the demand itself. The presence of candidates for sacrifice in the courts of the temple is a necessary incident of the institution. To strike a blow at this incident is to strike a blow at the institution, and this is what was intended.

But, while he bids the owners of the cattle to remove them, he does not trust it solely in their hands. He helps to expel them. He helps not only with words, but with a woven scourge. He drives not to the altar, but away from the altar; not into the court, but out of the court of the temple into the open street or open country. The rattle of coin on the broker's board, the clatter of

voices higgling over the price of a calf, might well enough disgust a spiritual man. But all that could have been prevented by preventing the sale alone. That did not make it necessary to drive the intended victims away. The expulsion indicates the true aim of the blow—namely, at the head of the whole system. The intended victims expelled, the institution itself could not live a moment, and his act of expelling them shows that he meant to kill the institution. The Jews so understood it. They saw that he meant an internecine struggle. The Sanhedrim said: "He or we must die." Their table and all their living, their business as curators of the Jewish religion, their name and fame—all were at stake. Our Lord knew it as well as they. He knew that the contest would cost his life. He knew, also, that he should win, and that the victory would be worth even all that it cost.

His answer to the Samaritan woman is negatively and positively conclusive. She wants his decision between Gerizim and Jerusalem for sacrifice; and he says, "In neither place and never; the Father seeketh true and spiritual worshipers." This decision of our Lord is universal; always and everywhere he wants spiritual worship, and that only. This absolutely and for all time excludes animal sacrifice.

Herein, as in all else that he did, our Lord spake and acted by virtue of that clear and just moral insight which is true inspiration. Whoever has this moral insight is inspired, though he have written never a line in the Bible—witness our Lord himself inspired far beyond all the sacred writers put together—and whoever has not this moral insight is uninspired, though he have written much and in the Bible.

The feast of the passover, as we have seen, was the last supper of the Israelites in Egypt, and was kept as an emancipation celebration by the Jews. It matters not

whether the story was framed to explain the feast, or whether the feast sprang from the fact, or whether the story and the feast, one or both, were the reconsecration to God of an old rite of animal worship. It would be, in any case, but such a happening as he sees any day who beholds the Roman devotees slowly and painfully ascending on their knees the *scala santa* of the Lateran, devoutly believing that they are the sacred steps over which Christ ascended to his trial before Pilate's judgment seat. But Christ was not born in Bethlehem when Julius Cæsar climbed on his knees the steps of the Capitol on the opposite hill to avert by this act of humility the anger of Nemesis, the goddess hostile to great fortunes. Our Lord was but "the turbulent Christ" to the Emperor Claudius when he painfully kneeled up the same steps in gratitude to his gods for the conquest of Britain. If Moses rebaptized a rite of animal worship into recognition of one supreme God, he did what many and many a time reformers have done in endeavoring to purify and elevate the spirit of a custom whose observance they could not prevent.

The same night in which he was betrayed, in the same spirit of accommodation and aspiration, our Lord took the feast of the passover, eliminated from it every possible relic of cruelty and error, turned it into a farewell feast to his disciples, made it the tenderest memorial to himself and an emancipation celebration for all the world—emancipation from the old covenant of blood to the new covenant of purity. The old passover was a meal for strengthening the body; the Lord's farewell supper was chiefly for the consolation and sustenance of the soul. It was a sad festival, for the man Christ Jesus was parting from his friends, and the shadow of his troubled spirit fell upon their loving, anxious, ignorant hearts. The passover had been a hurried feast, but the

last supper was a long love feast, with time enough not only to satisfy hunger, but enough for rash, headlong, but real love to protest against the Master's object-lesson in humility; time enough for the curious but not overconfident disciples to urge the confident love of John upon an anxious question which *was* answered and not rebuked; time enough for the avarice of Judas, attending under the disguise of affection, to see itself detected and dismissed to the sincerity of crime, to the eternal punishment of remorse and human infamy; time enough for a conversation whose fragmentary report is our most dear and cherished legacy of the human heart of Christ. It was a glorious supper, for in its gentle and solemn friendliness was symbolized and signalized the redemption of the world from the old domain of blood and beasts to the new domain of love and light.

The world has been long in learning the lesson which is yet but partially learned. The very disciples for whose companionship at this feast their Master passionately longed knew so little of his spirit and his mission that they lifted their lips from the cup of his blessing to bicker about precedence. We have not gone so far beyond them that we can afford to scoff. We harden his words into a coarse literalism, we reject his tender, pure, and sacred symbols, and insist upon a revolting and impossible interpretation whose hideous features we strive to veil under the thin disguise of miracle. With the moan of a thousand generations in his ears, the moan of hapless beasts massacred in vain expiations, the sinless son of God held up the bread that gives but not surrenders life, and made it the parting token of his willing sacrifice, leading all martyrdoms for the truth. "*This* is *my* body." To the innocent blood of sacrificial slaughter crying unto him from the ground of the whole wide earth he listened and made answer; he took the

cup and said unto them: "*This* is *my* blood of the new testament." What was it? Not blood at all, but the fruit of the vine, a real stimulant. What was it? Not flesh at all, but the fruit of the ground, a real nutriment.

It was a symbol he had often used to represent the close vital connection between himself and humanity, the succor he would impart to souls. Sometimes he had been well-nigh impatient at their failing to find the true spiritual content of his teaching, which he had well and often explained.

"How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" asked the heavy-browed Jews. "I am the living bread," answered Jesus. "I am that bread of life. He that believeth on me hath everlasting life." But, more blind than the blindest scribe and more stolid than the stolidest Pharisee, without the excuse of a long-established custom of atonement by beast and of expiation by blood, without the excuse of the natural hostility to innovation, there are thousands among us to-day who turn away from Christ's purification and spiritualization of worship, and when asked, "How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" reply, "By a miracle!" We are so determined to worship with blood and sacrifice, we are so resolved to go back to the beggarly elements of this pagan world from which Christ came to free us, that we summon the Lord from his spiritual heavens into a loaf of bread in order that there may be something to sacrifice!

This is not an improvement on the Jewish ritual; it is a retrogression to the pagan ritual. If there must be a sacrifice, it is better to sacrifice an animal than a man. If that man is the prince of life, the Son of God, then to sacrifice him is a crime without a name. If there must be a priest to sustain religion, better that it should be a Jew slaying a bullock upon an altar than God cruci-

fying his beloved Son upon the cross, because that is a profanation of the heavens.

It is difficult to speak of this with the respect due to thought and sincerity. It is in direct and degrading opposition to the teaching and trend of our Lord. If it *could* be true, it would be shocking beyond expression. It would substitute for the tenderest rite of Christianity the grossest rite, the most horrible appetite, of heathendom.

The same night in which he was betrayed, the same night on which he took the bread and blessed it and said, "This is my body," he said : "I am the vine, ye are the branches." The same Jesus said : "I am the good shepherd. I am the door of the sheep." Did he mean to teach that by a miracle Christ becomes instantly a vegetable, a shepherd, a wooden door ? But such a transubstantiation is just as authoritative, just as reasonable, just as important, no more absurd, and far less loathsome.

To the rational, reverent, inquiring mind the only explanation given is that it is a mystery. But a grotesque, brutalizing, retrograde, unnatural transformation is not a mystery; it is a monstrosity. When Christ said, "This is my body," his body was intact and present. There is no pretense that his body then and there was the loaf of bread or entered into the loaf of bread, or had any relation to the loaf of bread, except by the perfectly natural process of reception and assimilation. Christ gave no hint of any miracle performed or required. There is no more reason why believers should be taught that they eat the dead Christ than why the apostles should have been taught that they ate the living Christ. To crave a miracle to satisfy or gratify the religious nature is as if one should refuse to be enlightened on the mechanical secret of a phonographic doll because he loves mystery, while

all around him in every human being lies the insoluble mystery of life.

We dwell in mysteries—in the solemn, eternal unknown.

Without controversy, great is the mystery of godliness. God was manifest in the flesh. He is not manifest in the loaf of bread, in the glass of wine. It is only that some men say he is there. God *manifest* in the flesh, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, reconciling the world unto himself, is a mystery which even the angels desire to look into. We speak the wisdom of God in a mystery, even the hidden wisdom which God ordained before the world to our glory—a mystery which we shall never, if ever, resolve until God ordains it, after the world, to his own glory.

"Behold I show you a mystery. We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed"—the unspeakable mystery of death. We go down to the gates with our beloved, peering in vain beyond, seeing nothing beyond, yet feeling sure that in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, this corruptible *must* put on incorruption, this mortal *must* put on immortality; but only when this corruptible *has* put on incorruption, only when this mortal has put on immortality, shall death be swallowed up in victory. This side the gates death prevails, but beyond the gates—"O Death, where is thy sting? O Grave, where is thy victory?" Lost in everlasting life. In the presence of real mystery, our toy mysteries seem the coarse and trivial things they are.

The apostles assimilated and disseminated the thought and purpose of Christ very quickly and, on the whole, very thoroughly.

They were, above all, Jews, lovingly and loyally subject to the law of Moses, desirous above all things not to be considered disloyal, anti-Judaistic. They did not

understand Christ, but they had been in touch with him, and they at least knew that the law of Moses was to be fulfilled by love. In their first assembling after they had recovered breath from the unexpected downfall of their leader, and had a little readjusted themselves after the whirlwind of disappointment, amazement, bewilderment that befell them, they promulgated their wonderful new gospel, in which was no sacrifice, but "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins."

"Repent ye, therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out."

But Peter will not be misunderstood to mean that this is a new departure—radicalism, a despite to the old faith. He insists that it is the continuance, the corollary of that very faith. It is no new deity, but "the God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob, the God of our fathers, that hath glorified his son Jesus. Those things, which God before hath showed by the mouth of all his prophets, that Christ should suffer, he hath so fulfilled. Whom the heaven must receive until the times of restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began. For Moses truly said unto the fathers, A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me ; him shall ye hear in all things whatsoever he shall say unto you. And it shall come to pass, that every soul, which will not hear that prophet, shall be destroyed from among the people. Yea, and all the prophets from Samuel and those that follow after, as many as have spoken, have likewise foretold of these days. Ye are the children of the prophets, and of the covenant which God made with our fathers, saying unto Abraham, And in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed. Unto you first God, having raised up

his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities."

Stephen, in his last bold words which cost him his life, turned aside from his rapid sketch of Jewish history, at the gates of Solomon's temple, to declare: "Howbeit the Most High dwelleth not in temples made with hands; as saith the prophet. Heaven is my throne, and earth is my footstool: what house will ye build me? saith the Lord: or what is the place of my rest? Hath not my hand made all these things?"

When a Roman soldier and officer, a Christian who had never heard of Christ, sent to bring Peter to declare Christ unto him, Peter even to him preached the gospel of Christ as nothing new, but a fulfilling of the old law. "To him give all the prophets witness that whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins."

He expressly declares that the Mosaic law was insufficient.

"Be it known unto you therefore, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins:

"And by him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses." It was with great difficulty that this new doctrine of remission of sins by repentance was grafted upon the old doctrine of remission of sins by rites and sacrifices. When Paul and Barnabas first went up to Antioch to open the door of faith to the Gentiles, a group of formalists promptly followed them to spoil the whole movement by preaching to the Antioch people, "Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye can not be saved."

We may suppose they were sincere followers of Christ, but they misapprehended the very pith and point of his teachings; and because a foolish friend is the worst of

foes, they made so much trouble that a delegation, headed by Paul and Barnabas, was sent to Jerusalem to lay it before the apostles for decision.

A council of the apostles and elders was convened—if the apostles were Congregationalists; an assembly or synod if they were Presbyterians—at which Peter spoke eloquently on the liberal side, saying in substance: "Men and brethren, God bare witness, giving the Gentiles the Holy Ghost, just as he did unto us, and put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith, as they had no law, but saving us who had the law, also by faith in Christ, and not by law. Why, therefore, should we insist upon putting their necks under the yoke of the law which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear, and which is no longer of any use even to us?"

The argument was unanswerable, and Paul and Barnabas immediately clinched it by reciting to the council the proofs of their ministry in the effect upon their hearers. Simeon followed in a speech of entire liberality, gentleness, and discrimination, justifying his judgment by precedent and, as many a judge has done, first deciding upon equity and then bringing the law to uphold it. An official letter missive was sent to the petitioners, entirely vindicating Paul and Barnabas, repudiating the commandment of circumcision, and laying upon the converts only "these necessary things: That ye abstain from meats offered to idols, and from things strangled, and from fornication."

Thus formally was the law of Moses pronounced obsolete by the highest Christian authority.

But it was to come up yet again.

After another long missionary tour, Paul and Barnabas again returned to Jerusalem to report to the council.

Their disciples had been very unwilling to let them go. Some went so far as to declare emphatically that

they spoke by the authority of the Holy Spirit in forbidding the departure of Paul and Barnabas; but Paul was accustomed to judge for himself as to when the Holy Spirit spoke and when it was only human wish, and he kept on.

The brethren welcomed them cordially and convened the council; listened to Paul's account of his great success among the Gentiles, and passed a resolution of congratulation, but then gently suggested that he was going a little too fast; that he was making trouble at home; not with them, but with the ill-informed who could not quite understand this wild new commingling of Jew and Gentile.

"When they heard it, they glorified the Lord, and said unto him, Thou seest, brother, how many thousands of Jews there are which believe; and they are all zealous of the law: And they are informed of thee, that thou teachest all the Jews which are among the Gentiles to forsake Moses, saying that they ought not to circumcise their children, neither to walk after the customs.

"What is it therefore? the multitude must needs come together: for they will hear that thou art come. Do therefore this that we say to thee: We have four men which have a vow on them; them take and purify thyself with them, and be at charges with them, that they may shave their heads: and all may know that those things, whereof they were informed concerning thee, are nothing; but that thou thyself also walkest orderly, and keepest the law.

"As touching the Gentiles which believe, we have written and concluded that they observe no such thing, save only that they keep themselves from things offered to idols, and from blood, and from what is strangled, and from fornication.

"Then Paul took the men, and the next day purify-

ing himself with them entered into the temple, to signify the accomplishment of the days of purification, until that an offering should be offered for every one of them."

I almost wonder that Paul did it, though there is a good deal to be said on both sides; but all his trouble subsequently recorded came from the doing, or at least came in spite of the doing. The attempted compromise, even if it was justifiable, absolutely failed. The Jews did not wish to be conciliated, and faster than Paul could exculpate himself from one slander, they inculpated him in another.

"When the seven days were almost ended, the Jews which were of Asia, when they saw him in the temple, stirred up all the people, and laid hands on him. Crying out, Men of Israel, help: This is the man that teacheth all men everywhere against the people, and the law, and this place: and further brought Greeks also into the temple and hath polluted this holy place. (For they had seen before with him in the city Trophimus an Ephesian, whom they supposed that Paul had brought into the temple.)

"And all the city was moved, and the people ran together: and they took Paul, and drew him out of the temple: and forthwith the doors were shut," and all Jerusalem was in an uproar. The head of the police was called and came on the run with a *posse* of soldiers and dragged Paul out of the mob, more dead than alive, up the stairs and into the castle. But Paul with his prompt presence of mind spoke to the captain, who was apparently astonished to find by his address that Paul was a gentleman and a scholar. "Canst thou speak Greek? Art not thou that Egyptian which before these days madest an uproar and leadest out into the wilderness four thousand men that were murderers?" Poor Paul! not only beaten and dragged by the populace, but thought

a seditious ragamuffin by the authorities. So much for his docile obedience to the council! So much for their gentle attempt at compromise!

Paul answered with spirit: "I am a man which am a Jew of Tarsus, in Cilicia, a citizen of no mean city. I beseech thee to suffer me to speak unto the people."

Paul was so strong a rationalist that he was not able to bring himself to believe that people would not listen to reason. But to this mob he appealed in vain through the "great silence" with which they heard him at the beginning. The moment he asserted his mission to the Gentiles they renewed their yell and would have proceeded to violence but for the interposition of the officials.

We need not follow Paul through his trials, the dangers which he braved, the martyrdoms which he repelled by his adroitness or his courage. But it is to be observed that he took a higher tone. Undoubtedly he was thinking of this result of council when he wrote to the Galatians: "As many as desire to make a fair show in the flesh, they constrain you to be circumcised, only lest they should suffer persecution for the cross of Christ."

He had compromised a little under the influence of James and the elders and had suffered persecution just the same. Very likely he was thinking of this experience and justifying it to himself when he declared: "Unto the Jews I became as a Jew that I might gain the Jews, for the gospel's sake."

His final summary of opinion is: "Behold I, Paul, say unto you, Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace." Could repudiation be stronger?

His treatment of the passover is simple and final to all who respect his authority:

"For even Christ our passover is sacrificed for us. Therefore let us keep the feast, not with old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness; but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth."

It might have been New England professors of theology whom Paul describes when proclaiming the authenticity of his gospel and his right to preach it:

"Who also hath made us able ministers of the new testament; not of the letter, but of the spirit: for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life. But their minds were blinded: for until this day remaineth the same vail untaken away in the reading of the old testament; which vail is done away in Christ.

"But even unto this day, when Moses is read, the vail is upon their heart."

In the Gospel to the Hebrews the theme of the sacrifices is most fully treated and Christ's relation to it most minutely delineated because it was addressed to Jews. This idea is entirely one of substitution. The old priesthood, the old ritual, is to be swept away and Christ is to be all in all.

We have misunderstood it. We do indeed sweep away the old ritual, the old priesthood, but, instead of substituting for it Christ, a spirit, God, a spirit, to be worshiped in spirit and in truth, we substitute a ritual of Christ, a priesthood of Christ, a sacrifice of Christ. The true substitution is that of Paul, the substitution of the abolition of all sacrifices in Christ. Our substitution is false—the substitution of continuance of sacrifice in Christ. This is the great argument of the Epistle to the Hebrews. We have already the comparison with Melchizedek, showing Melchizedek to be of a higher order than the Levitic priesthood, because in Abram the Levitic priesthood paid tithes to him; and Christ, pronounced a priest after the order of Melchizedek, which is no order at all, because

Melchizedek had no predecessor and no successor. The writer adds to this a wealth of comparisons showing the imperfectness of the Mosaic priesthood and service and the perfection of Christ as a substitute for all priesthood and service; but this is no argument for us. We have no Mosaic ritual to be thrown off; we never observed it. The argument of the Epistle to the Hebrews was successful. The altars were broken and were never restored; sacrificial blood was forever stanched. Yet we go on using the language of paganism and Judaism as if Christ were crucified but yesterday. The New Testament writers assure us that the Old Testament sacrifices were but a temporary and earthly figure, and we insist on using their language as if altars and burnt-offerings were a divine and permanent fact. Blood-atonement was the precursor of repentance-atonement. We make only the quality of the blood, lamb's blood, prefigure the quality of the blood, Christ's blood. Such a gospel of the blood of Christ is as much more horrible than a gospel of bullock's blood as the murder of a man is more horrible than the slaying of beasts. There was an annulling of the old commandment, argues Paul, because of its weakness and unprofitableness and the bringing in of a better hope. Could condemnation of the Mosaic ritual be more clearly given? For if the first covenant had been faultless, then would no place have been sought for a second. The first covenant had ordinances of divine service and a worldly sanctuary, for there was a tabernacle made with the candlestick and the table and show-bread, and the veil, the golden censer, and the ark of the covenant overlaid roundabout with gold, and the golden pot that had manna, and Aaron's rod that budded, and the cherubim of glory—of all which, like Paul himself, we can not now speak particularly, which was a figure for the time then present in which were offered

both gifts and sacrifices that could not make him that did the service perfect as pertaining to the conscience.

But Christ, being come a high priest of good things to come, makes a new covenant, and this it is, "saith the Lord : I will put my laws into their mind and write them in their hearts, and they shall not teach every man his neighbor, saying, know the Lord, for all shall know me." The tabernacle of the new time shall be greater and more perfect than the old—*not made with hands,* that is, no tabernacle at all. Moses took the blood of calves and goats and sprinkled all the vessels of the ministry, for without shedding of blood there is no remission under the Mosaic law ; but our religion has no such precept, for Paul taught so successfully that the blood of bulls and goats can not take away sin, that we have never sprinkled a church with blood. "In burnt-offerings and sacrifices for sin thou hast had no pleasure, which are offered by the law. Having, therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest, by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way which he hath consecrated for us, through the veil—that is to say, his flesh—let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our *hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience* and our bodies washed with pure water. By him, therefore, let us offer the *sacrifice of praise to God* continually—that is, the fruit of our lips. To do good and communicate forget not, for with such sacrifices God is well pleased." Paul so thoroughly disbelieves and discards the law that he upbraids the foolish Galatians for reverting, after their acceptance of Christ, to the weak and beggarly elements of their pagan Judaism. He begs them to stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made them free, and not be entangled again with the yoke of Judaistic bondage. Over and over and over, but not with too much iteration, as our observation shows, he affirms that the

law is nothing. All the law is fulfilled in one word —love. "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God." "Bear ye one another's burdens and *so* fulfill the law of Christ."

Not with too much iteration, for still, eighteen centuries afterward, we cling to the phraseology and the ideas of paganism, and the veil is upon our hearts. We refuse to Christ his work, to Paul his victory, and maintain that, under Christ, as under Moses and Jupiter and all the gods of this world, without shedding of blood there is no remission of sin. Now, here, under the full shining of the sun of righteousness, our pulpits and our religious press declare that "the doctrines of the Gospel as Paul stated them will and must stand through all time as the faith of the Church; and the words which he used, or their equivalents when his words are translated into other languages, must also stand as the received and established language of the Church for these doctrines. The Church can not outgrow either the doctrines or the words, or so revise either as to remove from either the Pauline stamp. What was good enough for the age in which the apostle lived is good enough in any age. What was a 'form of sound words' in his day can not, either as a form or in its contents, become obsolete by the lapse of time. Saints and sinners to-day need just what saints and sinners needed when Paul lived and preached and wrote.

"The apostle had several favorite expressions which he often used as defining the work of Christ—'Christ died for us'; 'Christ died for our sins'; 'reconciled to God by the death of his Son'; 'redemption through his blood'; 'Christ our passover is sacrificed for us'; Christ 'who gave himself for our sins'; Christ 'set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood'; 'being now justified by his blood'; these are specimens of Paul's

rhetoric in stating the doctrine of Christ's *sacrificial* and *expiatory* work in behalf of sinners.

"No advance in culture and no improvements in theology can or should supersede Paul's Epistles, or substitute for them either different ideas or different and better modes of expressing Christian ideas."

And no more full and deliberate statement can be made than this of the conviction that Paul preached in vain and Christ died in vain. Paul preached to a people bound in the thongs of the Mosaic law, and still within sight of the cross. Yet he preached to so little purpose that the eighteen centuries since have not redeemed us from one error of doctrine or practice; but we are bound by the same thongs, we have no more conscience of Christ, no ignorance has become less dense, no misapprehension has become obsolete! Eighteen centuries have brought us no step from paganism, and what was fit for a people used to blood-atonement is proper for us!

This is the decree of unreason. It is too gross and too prominent an error to permit any softening of terms. It is the utter upturning and negation of the teaching of Christ and Paul. It is pulling down what they died to upbuild. The Church *has* outgrown both the doctrine and the words. Christ has not died in vain. Paul did not preach in vain. What was not only good enough, but divinely good for the age of Paul, is obsolete and inappropriate to this age. Paul's age was fettered upon the altar of sacrifice. Paul's preaching, Christ's life and death, have ransomed this age altogether from sacrifice, and there remains for us only *repentance* for the remission of sins. What was a wise, practical form of sound words in Paul's days is but a historical, not a practical, form of sound words for us. Saints and sinners to-day do not need many a form of sound words which both needed in Paul's day, for not a saint or sinner of us all is in any

danger of slaying a turtle-dove or two young pigeons for the forgiveness of sins.

Nearly every phrase which is here cited from the Bible should be obsolete—should be used never except in its appropriate historical sense. They have, as this writer says, "imparted their own coloring to the rhetoric of piety," and a frightful coloring it is, ghastly and repulsive :

> "There is a fountain filled with blood
> Drawn from Immanuel's veins,
> And sinners plunged beneath that flood
> Lose all their guilty stains."

Nothing but long usage prevents us from seeing the hideousness of the picture. The Jews were familiar with blood. We recoil from it. It was to them a term of purification. For us blood does not cleanse. It stains. It is the stain of stains. For us there is no sacrificial atoning quality in blood. It is the sign manual of the gravest crime.

"Reconciled to God by the death of his Son," "redemption through his blood," "Christ our passover," "set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood"—they are all relics of Judaism and of the pagan element in Judaism. Paul was laboring to show it ; to convince the Jews that the law—of which propitiation and justification were a component part—was good for nothing, was obsolete. By the deeds of the law shall no flesh be justified. The righteousness of God—alone, without the law, outside of the law, having nothing to with the law—is manifested in Christ Jesus, proclaiming redemption through repentance. All the propitiation which God wants is repentance, which is technically no propitiation at all. Faith in Christ is not faith in the blood of his body, but in the inspiration of his spirit.

We have better authority than the pulpit or the press

for saying that such language *will* become obsolete by the lapse of time. Paul himself declared that Christ had *blotted out* the handwriting of ordinances that was against us and contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross. I think we shall presently be content to let it stay there and not try to keep it alive, or in the semblance of life, by cherishing it as the essential phraseology of all religion. The wrappings of a mummy would not decorate, but disguise and disgust, the living man.

Atonement, expiation, propitiation, are not the doctrines of Christ, were not taught by Christ. They are not in Christianity. They were preached in the Old Testament, but the object of the New Testament is to destroy them. They were accepted by Christ and the apostles as a historical fact; they were recognized as an aspiration and effort of humanity toward order and righteousness and spirituality; greatly successful as against idolatry and atheism, but against the law of Christ so entirely imperfect and inadequate as to merit only dismissal. They were characterized as but the school-master to bring Israel to Christ, to be discarded when the master came, as the servant is discarded by the child whom he has led to school when the school is reached.

The atonement of Christ is at-one-ment; the uplifting of man out of his beast nature into his divine spiritual nature, and thus making him at one with God. It is not averting the wrath of God by slaying an innocent animal victim in the stead of a guilty human criminal; still less is it averting God's wrath by slaying God's holy Son instead of a guilty criminal. It is God, in the fullness of time, giving to humanity the impulse of a divine partaking, showing man his kinship with God, saving him from sin by revealing its real character in contrast with a nature wholly human yet wholly divine and sinless; so drawing man to God, not by the law of a carnal com-

mandment, but by the power of an endless life. The worship of God by the slaughter of beasts characterizes the progress of man up from his own animal nature toward perfect spiritual being. The use of the phraseology of animal worship is the trail of the serpent still over us all, though the serpent has writhed past. The at-one-ment of Christ is the final rescue of man from the control of these lower forces into union with God in spirit and in truth.

When Christ, after the resurrection, summed up to his disciples the object of his death, what was it? The great and final atonement—a sacrifice of life to take away sin? Not at all. "Thus it behooved Christ to suffer and to rise that *repentance and remission of sins* should be preached in his name among all nations"; not blood and remission of sins. He knew that the suffering of no other being than the transgressor himself can at all vindicate the honor of the law which he has broken. The transgressor's own suffering must, as far as it can, restore the honor of the law which he breaks. And this it does, so far as it does, by showing that the lawgiver was right and just in the law. Incomparably the best and truest reparation that a transgressor can make for his transgression is repentance and return to obedience. Nothing honors a broken law like ceasing to break it.

The baptism of repentance for remission of sins.

We drone out the words in meaningless monotones. We have lived in their light so long that we heed it no more than the sunshine. We hold it by inheritance, and are hardly aware that the world has not always held it. But its dawn was the herald of a wonderful day, a new departure, a radical reformation. To the human race it was a glorious deliverance! Christ was indeed the paschal lamb in this: that whereas the paschal lamb memorialized the great emancipation of the Jews from the

long bondage in Egypt, Christ wrought the emancipation of the human race from beastly worship to spiritual worship! The whole earth was sodden with innocent blood. All the skies were darkened with the smoke of burning sacrifice in expiation for sin. Christ came, the Son of God. The lurid light of blood-sacrifices went down forever. The sun of righteousness shone in the clear heaven, with what healing in his wings! The murky mists, the somber shadows, rolled away. The polluted earth was purified, and men learned once for all the good tidings of great joy that there is no other atonement, and no other expiation, and no other baptism given under heaven among men than the baptism of REPENTANCE for the remission of sins.

## CHAPTER VII.

### THE ELECTION OF PAUL AND THE ELECTION OF PRESBYTERY.

*A mother, restless under the first sharp anguish of an inconceivable loss, welcomed the distraction of listening to the following essay while it was yet in the undress of first composition. Her daughter, a young wife and mother, of the Catholic communion, begged also to listen, and manifested the deepest interest in the theme as well as intelligent acquaintance with the subject. For further study, she avowed her purpose of attending the Bible class, though aware that it might run athwart some of the teachings which she accepted. But hers was a mind which rejected arbitrary limitations and ever pushed out boldly in all directions.*

*She rose from the reading to go out into this fair world for the last time. With her two little boys and her young sister she drove to the house of a friend whose work had lain among the Indians in the far-off Cherokee land. Returned home, some hidden force of disease, that had been lurking in wait, seized her with sudden sway, laid her unconscious in her father's arms, shut her soul in even from her husband's voice, till in the end of the Sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week, the arms that would have held her, the love that never failed her, were constrained to give her up to death.*

"*And we smile to think God's greatness flows around our incompleteness,*
*Round our restlessness, his rest.*"

*From the opposite extremes of the Church of Christ, from the Presbyterian female missionary who received her last visit on earth, and from the Roman Catholic archbishop, who was her confessor and friend, I pay a tribute to the most shrinking and self-mistrustful of God's creatures;—showing that in Jesus Christ neither Protest-*

*antism availeth anything, nor Catholicism, but faith which worketh by love.*

*To her husband wrote the archbishop:*

"*I beg to offer my sincerest sympathy on the loss of your devoted wife. The most substantial consolation I can offer you arises from the memory of her many virtues and deep religious feeling and personal piety. She always struck me as a remarkable woman, cast in a higher mold than the generality of her sex, and therefore in some sense peculiar, but always boldly honest and intense. I shall not forget her in the Holy Sacrifice, and I shall ask that God may give you fortitude to bear the heavy cross.*"

*And soothingly, like a comforting voice from the grave, came these dear words from the gentle missionary, telling us of that last precious hour whose story, but for this kind thoughtfulness, we should not have known—whose story is full of peace:*

"*I can not realize that the modest, unselfish life is ended, that the heart, so filled with love for her dear ones, so kind to every one, has ceased to beat. To me this comes as a great personal loss. I was for some days her guest at Fort Gibson, and had I been a princess of the blood royal instead of a poor missionary teacher, she could not have shown me more exquisite hospitality.*

"*We had many conversations upon religious subjects, and, differing as we did in outward profession, we were of the same faith. Last Tuesday, when she came in to see me, much of our conversation was upon religious topics, starting from her telling me of the paper you had been writing upon revision of the creed, and which she was greatly interested in. Incidentally came the question of death, and she expressed her fearlessness of it, and showed by her words a sincere, child-like faith which it will always be very sweet to me to remember.*

"*I wish I could put in words the impression her life has made upon me. It seemed in my brief knowledge of it so selfless a life. She seemed never to think of herself—always of others.*

"*During the days of her illness I prayed earnestly that she might be spared. Now I can only pray that the Divine Comforter may be very present in your grief-stricken household. She is 'with Christ, which is far better.'*"

*To the dead in Christ in whom is life—to*

*ALICE STANWOOD BLAINE COPPINGER*

*I dedicate this last essay which held her unclouded attention.*

THE doctrine of election as taught by St. Paul and the doctrine of election as taught by the Presbyterian standards and the Congregational creeds are as wide apart as the poles—exactly as wide apart as the electric poles of thought. The election of Paul is the negative of Judaism, a liberal movement, a new departure, the broadening of a stubborn sectarianism of birth into a recognition of the universal Fatherhood of God. The election of Presbytery is at present the positive of misconception; not so much a standstill as a retrogression from Paul, the narrowing of Godhood to sects and creeds.

It is held in Congregational and Presbyterian churches that salvation is effected by an election and an immediate interposition of God. God chooses some from the mass of the lost, on whom he exercises a special power.

"The rest of mankind [*i. e.*, the non-elect] God was pleased, according to the unsearchable counsel of his own will, whereby he extendeth or withholdeth mercy as he pleaseth, for the glory of his sovereign power over his creatures [*præterire*], to pass by, and to ordain them to dishonor and wrath for their sin, to the praise of his glorious justice."

Many people are so bent on rejecting this theological error that they will not investigate its history, or credit its respectability, or honor its origin. We have so identified our creeds with Scripture teaching that men think there is no alternative between ridiculing Paul and denying their own reason; consequently they ridicule, or at least reject, Paul. If this were the alternative they would not be far wrong. No absurdity can be greater than to require a man to stand on the ruins of his mind in order to accept a statement. "God created man in his own image; in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them." Because man is created in the image of God, he is able to judge of God.

Male and female, God created man to judge of God. Nay, he entreats men to judge: "Come, now, and let us reason together, saith the Lord." Nay, he commands men to judge: "Why, out of your own selves, do ye not judge what is right?" is a question which rhetoric characterizes as the most intense form of affirmation. Under this divine command and divine likeness a first principle of the Christian consciousness is that "nothing can be good in him which evil is in me."

Dr. Vincent, of the Union Seminary, in the Presbyterian Assembly recognizes the situation and plants himself upon his manhood: "As a teacher of the New Testament Scriptures in one of the Church's theological schools, I am not content that God by the arbitrary decree of his own will should condemn me to eternal torment in hell. Paul tells me I have no right to reply; I am only a lump of clay in the potter's hands, and he has a right to make of me a vessel for base uses if he so choose. I deny it. I say I am not a lump of clay, but a man made in God's image. This word of Paul's is not the last word. If it were, it would be, as some one has truthfully said, at once a satire of reason upon herself and the suicide of revelation."

The first point in any argument is to know what the man said; next, to know what he meant.

The Presbyterian conventions have been arguing fully, freely, splendidly, the allied questions of election, reprobation, God's sovereignty; but if this is the best they can do for Paul, Paul has fared rather hardly at their hands.

I stand by Paul! The strong argument alleged in and out of convention to show that God may doom men, of his own good pleasure, to everlasting death, is drawn from the ninth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, and the declaration is confidently made that in this chapter the doctrine of reprobation is more strongly stated than

it is in the Presbyterian Confession. Would it not be wise, it is asked, to see first if men can revise this doctrine out of the Scripture before we attempt to revise it out of the Confession?

It is a fair proposal; but the doctrine is not in Scripture.

"As it is written, Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated."

"He saith to Moses, I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion."

"Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why hast thou made me thus? Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honor, and another unto dishonor?"

The old-school Presbyterian reads this and confesses that it is tough, but closes his teeth hard and resolves loyally and bravely to stand by it as the very word of God. The radical scoffs at it as absurd and tramples it under foot, and even the moderate, like Dr. Vincent, thinks that Paul is a little out!

It is neither absurd nor tough, and Paul is wholly in. It is the power of God and the wisdom of God; and, still more, it is the love of God unto salvation; as it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, world without end. Amen.

For, in these assertions, Paul was not preaching the doctrine of reprobation; he was preaching against it. Theologically it was not in his mind. Future destiny was not what he was talking about. What was in his mind was the widening of God's love to all the world, against narrowing it to the Jewish nation, as the Jews claimed it should be narrowed.

Let us go back to the day of Paul. The Jews around him believed in hereditary salvation for the seed of Abra-

ham. They believed themselves the one nation, beloved of God. They had indeed been chosen of God for a particular purpose. This we need not learn from any miraculous divine utterance. We trace it backward in the world's history, the Bible confirming it. That purpose was, if not the discovery, at least the preservation and promulgation to the human race of the idea that God is one and that God is righteous. The Jews held this idea clear and close, while other nations were only groping toward it. Under the domination of this idea the Jews inferred that they were therefore the pet people of God. They inferred that God had given them this great mission, not because he had given them certain traits which best adapted them to transact it successfully, but because he loved them more than any other nation. They were his exclusive favorites. Naturally they therefore considered themselves as better than any other nation. To be a Jew was to be a pious man, a religious man. They looked down upon all other peoples as barbarians. The Jews were superior and sacred, elect and select of Heaven, not to do a certain work for the world, but to receive favor from Heaven as descendants of Abraham. There was no salvation outside of Jewry.

Thus the Jews believed profoundly in reprobation—in the reprobation of everybody but themselves. Against this idea Paul threw himself with all the fervor of his logic.

Paul went on a new crusade. It was the great era of theological history. This narrow rivulet of life had flowed down through two thousand years, diverging into slender currents and upspringing in living fountains under the inspiration of poet and prophet, the Davids, the Isaiahs, the Micahs, but now at last in Christ broadening out into a mighty river, whose waters should wash the shores of the wide world forevermore. It was a thorough

reversal of the whole Jewish polity. It was an upheaval of the whole idea of Jewish dignity. It was taking from the Jews the *king*dom of heaven, breaking it up into a republic, and making them but a single and equal state with others in that republic. Already subjugated by the Roman Empire, it was wasting away their last hope of aristocracy and authority and the resumption of ancient splendor, and dooming them to the perpetual territorial inferiority which their weakness threatened, but from which they ever hoped to be redeemed in some supernatural way by their peculiar favoritism and friendship with God. So little did they understand what they had been chosen for!

Paul was the leader of this movement, this leveling, democratic, politico-theological movement. It was his special business, his sphere, his mission. He called himself the Apostle to the Gentiles, and he magnified his office. He was not appointed with the original twelve. He had a separate ordination and installation, but he claimed as divine a sanction as that of the original twelve. He pressed urgently the claim of his clients, the Gentiles, to be as much and as justly the children of God as were the Jews, yet always defended himself against charges of disloyalty to his own nation. He did not so much ask as demand recognition of his rights and of the rights of his Gentiles: "Be it known therefore unto you that the salvation of God is sent unto the Gentiles!" It was not a prayer for privilege, but a proclamation of equal rights.

Undoubtedly learning has changed, and learning will continue to change, our translation; but, just as it stands, the argument is not only clear, but luminous, and perfectly easy to trace. The Jews were elected of God, Paul admits, but, in the first place, not all Israel. Not all the children of Abraham were the children of God, even in

the narrow Jewish sense, but only the children of Isaac; Ishmael's descendants were not included in the covenant; —not all the children of Isaac even—for "Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated." What, then, becomes of the Jewish claim that they were elect "because we have Abraham to our father?" Ishmael and Isaac, Jacob and Esau, were equally children of Abraham. If there were any force in this Jewish claim of exclusive and hereditary righteousness, both would alike have been "elected," "loved"; whereas all Jews recognized that Jacob had been elected and Esau reprobated. Elected to what? Heaven? No. Elected to be a peculiar people, to receive, to cherish, to transmit to their posterity, and thence to the ends of the earth, the idea of one God, a God of righteousness; the idea of a Redeemer, who should save his people from their sins. Reprobated to what? Hell? No. Reprobated from this special service—left to be merged in the surrounding nations, lost to history as most nations and tribes and small peoples of the East were lost, in regard to their individual and tribal existence. Any other kind of love for Jacob or for his descendants God has no more displayed than for Esau. He was continually chiding them, punishing them. Hatred, vengeance, might seem rather to characterize the election, the selection, which created the nation in slavery, continued them in repeated captivities, and, since Christ, has kept the Jews ever in the fore-front of history for homelessness, for the bitterest persecution, for unmerited reproach, till the wraith of the Wandering Jew is but an epitome of this nation without a country, while the name and the heritage of Esau have found the sweet, safe shelter of obscurity.

So far as we know their story, the children of Esau seem to have been as prosperous, as favored of God in basket and store and lore, as were the sons of Jacob, for

Esau took away with him all the persons of his house, and his cattle, and all his beasts, and all his substance, and went into the country from the face of his brother Jacob, because their riches were more than that they might dwell together, and the land could not bear them because of their cattle. When Esau went up to meet his brother coming home to Canaan, he was attended by a retinue of four hundred men. In the long genealogies Esau could boast as many dukes as Jacob; and it was the descendant of one of these, Duke Teman, who sat down in the ashes with Job seven days and seven nights without speaking, and then spoke, because he could not help it, such words of wisdom and piety and culture as show him to have been a man of parts, of thought and education. Job found him a miserable comforter; but the Church honors him to-day and barbs her arrow to the sinner, and sweetens her consolations to the saint, and pierces the fallacy of the sophist with extracts from the common sense of Eliphaz the Temanite, one of the three friends of the fallen Eastern magnate—Eliphaz the Temanite, a lineal descendant and ever so great grandson of Esau. Certainly there is no hate, only history to be seen in the dealings of Providence with the houses of both Jacob and Esau.

If we look back to the personal biography of Jacob and Esau, out of which both Paul and Malachi took their illustration, what do we find? God is not so much as mentioned in the business of Jacob's election. Esau was the elder, a man of action, of impulse, of impatience, a man of sport, a man of the stirring, outside world. Jacob was the younger, a man of reflection, calculation. Jacob took advantage of Esau's hunger, impetuosity, impatience, and bought for next to nothing the birthright which Esau in the famine of the moment foolishly undervalued. The bargain which Jacob con-

ceived in selfishness he confirmed with fraud and hypocritical assumption of piety; but, good or bad, weak or strong, the act by which Esau lost his birthright was Esau's act, not God's. He lost it, not because God loved Jacob and hated Esau, but because, in one hungry, thoughtless moment, he insanely sold it for a mess of pottage. God did not arbitrarily, absolutely, of his mere good pleasure, from all eternity, without reason or recourse, "elect" Jacob to salvation. He did but respect Esau's own "election" of Jacob to the eldest son's place. God "elected" Jacob to the primacy exactly as he elected Washington to the presidency—by ordinary human methods, and by no other. There is no sign of any miraculous interposition of God between Esau and Jacob, any love of God greater toward Jacob than toward Esau, nor is there any question of heaven or of soul's salvation. It was all about a matter of inheriting estate. It was merely a question of primogeniture and entail and illustrious history; and as such it was used by Paul to elucidate a question of larger sense and wider sweep—the question whether God was the father of the Jew alone, or the father of the Gentile also. The words *love* and *hate* are but a terse and intense expression of the value set by the Jews upon their position in the world, compared with that of kindred yet separate nations. The question is introduced to show that as the favored nation and the despised nation were both the seed of Abraham, the Jewish aristocracy of blood counts for nothing.

Having established the fact that salvation is not of hereditary transmission, because some of the children of Abraham were selected and some were excluded, Paul continues to argue that God was right in this selection, election of some Jews and exclusion of others, and inclusion of the Gentiles. "What shall we say, then? Is there unrighteousness with God? God forbid." God

was not bound by moral obligation to stand by the Jews alone and abandon the rest of the world. He had undeniable right to save the Gentiles also. God was confined by no heredity. God recognized no heredity. He is a Jew which is one "inwardly," a worshiper of the one righteous God. The only Judaism God respects is Judaism of character, not of blood. The really important feature of Judaism is its teaching the unity and righteousness of God, and demanding righteousness of man. If the Gentiles, without the Jewish law, have attained to righteousness, and if Israel, following that law, hath not attained to the law of righteousness, shall not God make known the riches of his glory on the Gentiles?

Dr. Shedd, after setting forth his view of the logic of this case, says:

"But God himself has decided the question. He asserts his sovereign right to optional decision in the matter of human salvation. In that wonderful description of his being and attributes which he gave to Moses, among other declarations he says: 'I will be gracious to whom I will be gracious, and will show mercy on whom I will show mercy.' In this solemn pronunciamento with which he prefaced the whole work of human salvation he distinctly declares that he is under no obligations to redeem sinful men, but whatever he does in the premises is of his own unobliged, free, and sovereign mercy and decision. God incarnate teaches the same truth in the Gospels. And St. Paul recites the words of God to Moses—'I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion'—as a conclusive and unanswerable demonstration of the divine sovereignty in salvation."

Did God preface the whole work of salvation with this pronunciamento—the whole work? According to received chronology, the world had already been going on

more than twenty-five hundred years. Was God all this time doing nothing for the creatures he had made? Abel and Enoch and Melchizedek, Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, the four hundred years of slavery in Egypt, the passover, and all the pain and peril and glory of the emancipation—was God not in all this? Was God doing nothing for his world?

Dr. Shedd reads in this solemn pronunciamento a declaration of God that he is not under obligation to redeem sinful men. I do not so read Moses. Paul did not so read Moses. I accept Paul's rendering and I reject Dr. Shedd's. I read with Paul in this solemn pronunciamento God's distinct declaration that he is under no obligation *not* to redeem sinful men.

God is sovereign of the whole world. He will have mercy on whom he will have mercy, Gentile as well as Jew. Is God to be restrained from showing mercy to one man because another man claims all God's mercy? Whom he will he hardeneth, Jew or Gentile, Esau or Pharaoh. The stress is not on the process of hardening, but on the persons hardened; not on the act of showing mercy, but on the object of mercy. Paul's point is to show God's impartiality as against the Jewish claim of partiality to them.

It would be easy if it were pertinent to point out that God hardened Pharaoh's heart exactly as he "reprobated" Esau, by the processes of human experience. If we study the history of the transaction, we find that God hardened Pharaoh's heart through the natural laws by which despotism, greed, self-indulgence, falseness, broken pledges blind the eyes to wisdom and righteousness, whether the eyes be those of the tyrant of Egypt or the Grand Monarch of France. Indulgence in sin dulls the sensitiveness of the soul to sin. This is not simply the revealed truth of the Bible; it is the com-

mon truism of the newspapers. We live under a social order, not established by any man, in which continued indulgence in sin, whether it be selfishness, or robbery, or murder, dulls in the soul the sense of guilt, hardens the heart. No one says it shall be so. Every one says it is so. You may state it thus: According to the law of man's nature, Pharaoh's heart was hardened by indulgence in oppression and rapacity. Put it thus, if it please you best. He means the same thing who says God, because law is but the mode of God's action, and this is a beneficent law—a law that worketh righteousness. Paul's point is that Jew and Gentile are under the same natural law, alike hardened by indulgence in sin, alike welcome to God in repentance of sin.

"Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why hast thou made me thus?"

Yes, if he that formed the thing blamed it and punished it for being thus formed. "Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honor and another unto dishonor?" Certainly; but he has no right to blame and punish the vessel he has made to dishonor for not being honorable. He has no right to blame and punish the earthen pudding-pan for not being a peach-blow vase. Presbyterians and Congregationalists have said that he has this right, but Paul never.

This meaning has been put into Paul's words by theology, but Paul never put it there. Paul, indeed, does not so much argue as assert God's sovereignty, but the examples he cites are not of arbitrary acts of God, but of God's acting through man's own free will and choice. Esau and Pharaoh were not outwardly, mechanically constrained to plunder and waste. They did exactly as they chose. Paul does not dwell on this point because it is not the point to which he speaks, but it is involved in

his words and implied in his argument. The clay in his hands is not the Presbyterian clay, out of which God has a right by eternal decree of his mere good pleasure to make one man who shall go to heaven, and another man who shall be doomed to hell forever. Paul's clay is the clay out of which Jew and Gentile are alike made. The Great Potter has a right to make of this clay vessels of honor —Jews—and vessels of dishonor—Gentiles—but he has also an equal right to make the Gentiles vessels of honor. Nay, what if some of these Jewish vessels of honor, despising their beauty and sacred purpose, should mar and crack and despoil themselves, and become vessels of wrath, and the potter should pour the riches of his invention upon what the Jews consider the vessels of dishonor, "Even us whom he hath called, not of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles?" It would be only what the Jewish scriptures had themselves declared—that they who were not considered the Lord's people, should come to be called the children of the living God. It was only what the prophets foretold: "In thee shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." The Jewish vase has no right to say to the Gentile vase, "What business have you to be a vase? Only the Jew shall be a vase. Let the Gentiles remain always pots!"

The illustration of the potter's clay was a favorite one among the Jews, but they never maltreated it as we have done. They never molded it into the image of an arbitrary, self-willed, irresponsible, unjust, omnipotent, spoiled child, and called it God—a worse idol than any god of wood or stone.

"The word which came to Jeremiah from the Lord, saying:

"Arise, and go down to the potter's house, and there I will cause thee to hear my words. Then I went down to the potter's house, and, behold, he wrought a work on

the wheels. And the vessel that he made of clay was marred in the hand of the potter: so he made it again another vessel, as seemed good to the potter to make it.

"Then the word of the Lord came to me, saying:

"O house of Israel, can not I do with you as this potter? saith the Lord. Behold, as the clay is in the potter's hand, so are ye in my hand, O house of Israel. At what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to pluck up, and to pull down, and to destroy it; if that nation, against whom I have pronounced, turn from their evil, I will repent of the evil that I thought to do unto them. And at what instant I speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom, to build and to plant it; if it do evil in my sight, that it obey not my voice, then I will repent of the good, wherewith I said I would benefit them."

This is divine sovereignty, but it is a reasonable sovereignty, founded on justice, on immutable right, tempered by mercy, and watched by love. It is a declaration of God's sovereignty accompanied by a distinct appeal to man's sense of right and wrong desert. We try to hide our false logic behind "the unsearchable counsel of his own will, whereby he extendeth or withholdeth mercy as he pleaseth." But God does not attempt to hide behind his own willfulness. God, with the utmost frankness, appeals to our reason: I am all-powerful, and all my power I exert to repress evil and to cherish good within the limit of your free choice.

The Westminster divines say that God, for the manifestation of his glory, has predestinated some men to everlasting death, and that they are particularly and unchangeably designed, and their number is so certain and definite that it can not be increased or diminished (Confession of Faith, chap. iii, secs. 3, 4). But God himself, through Ezekiel, says: "When I say unto the wicked,

*thou shalt surely die,* if he turn from his sin and do that which is lawful and right, . . . he shall surely live, *he shall not die.*"

"Woe unto him that striveth with his maker! Let the potsherd strive with the potsherds of the earth. Shall the clay say to him that fashioneth it, What makest thou? or thy work, He hath no hands?"

That, too, is divine sovereignty, but it is utterly reasonable. God, whether we call him God or Nature, is so great, so powerful, that it is as useless to deny or decry natural laws, whether material or moral, as it would be for the clay to decry the potter, God. Nature has created man, body and soul. We do not know whether the body is the prison of the spirit, or the servant of the spirit; whether the soul is evolved from the body, or the body from the soul. The question of immortality, the question of moral responsibility, is not at stake in either. One man is made with the power to turn everything he touches into gold, another into sentiment. One man is born with the sense of form and color, and he makes himself an artist. One man is born with an insight of invisible forces and possible combinations, and he becomes a great inventor. Many a time must the poor crock be tempted to say to the Great Potter: "Why hast thou made me thus, ugly and undecorative—always on the kitchen-shelf or in the oven's heat, till, cracked and worthless, I go down into the pit, while the precious vase, by no will of its own, stands always with its charge of lilies and roses, bearing no heavier burden than their fragrance, a thing of beauty and a joy forever?" I can not answer. I do not know. Herein is mystery, for the human crock is as aware of beauty and poetry and genius and ease as is the royal vase. I do not know why the Great Potter—being great, being omnipotent—did not grant to all an equal gratification;

but if you will concede another life than this, if you will concede infinite goodness with infinite power, I can wait the Great Teacher, Death, and God adore. If you impose upon me an omnipotence that has endowed me with reason yet gives me no reasons, that commands my present judgment, yet contradicts the principles he has himself established, and intrenches himself behind his own inscrutability, a God arbitrary, self-willed, inconsistent, ordaining his creatures without their volition, and then dooming them, or leaving them, to eternal suffering, eternal hunger and thirst and disappointment and sin and remorse and pain—there is no such God! He is the Frankenstein monster of logic—the wild engine of a too strenuous theological system.

God is immeasurable, and we can not comprehend him; but he is entirely frank and intelligible in all that he demands of us. He does not require of us a decision which he does not give us the means to make. He does not command a loyalty to what he has made us loathe. With absolute assertions of infinite power, he joins equally absolute assertions of infinite righteousness:

"I will go before thee, that thou mayest know that I the Lord am God; though thou hast not known me.

"I form the light and create darkness.

"Thus saith the Lord, *Ask* me of things. I have created man, but I have raised him up in righteousness.

"I have not spoken in secret. I *declare* things that are right."

It was the Egyptians, the Ethiopians, the Sabeans, idol-makers, who complained that the Israelites worshiped a God who "hidest thyself." "I the Lord speak righteousness so clearly that every one shall say, In the Lord have I righteousness and strength."

It is the necessities of an unnecessary theological sys-

tem that constrain us to these fiendish misrepresentations. It is not the love of Christ that constrains us. Christ "came not into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved." Saved from what? From sin. Not from a future hell, but from present sin.

In the late discussions over revision one of the opponents of revision said: "Just here lies a point of great peril. The Calvinistic system is so beautifully and logically connected in all its parts that to alter a statement in one place necessitates a corresponding alteration all through the system."

Professor Stowe once remarked: "When any theological theory claims to be a complete system, I know without examination that it is false." The reason is clear: In the endless chain of divine work we know only that minute part of it that enters out of the darkness at the beginning of earthly life and re-enters the darkness at the close of earthly life. To attempt to construct—to fancy we have constructed—out of the few links presented by the world's experience, the divine endless chain, the complete plan of salvation, the perfected theological system—is an idle dream. If our theology, as far as it goes, is correct, it must be imperfect. To be true it must be fragmentary. If the Calvinistic system is so beautifully and logically connected in all its parts that it can not allow the introduction of any new light, any new truth, without fatal disturbance and dislocation, shall we wrap it in tissue-paper and cotton-wool and lay it carefully out of harm's way? No. Condemn it for structural weakness! Turn and overturn till the truth shake not the earth only, but also heaven! All upheaval will but serve to shake out the error and shake the truth more firmly into place.

It is held by many in the Presbytery that if we do

not let the old error stand a while longer, there will be the great calamity of division.

"An acceptable creed will be the fruit of peace, not of war. Fanaticism may come out of excitement, but a creed must be the result of prayer and quiet study."

"This discussion is opening already new lines of division in every church, and no matter which party succeeds, there will be an irritated and dissatisfied minority which will renew and keep up the struggle in successive assemblies. This will occasion excitement and ill-feeling instead of peace and brotherly love."

"The immediate effect of the overture and of the newspaper discussion which it has generated has been unsettling. Men's minds have been disturbed and the impression needlessly created that our standards are seriously at fault."

But what of Christ? Did he decline to make a division in the church of burnt-offering for the remission of sins? On the contrary, he came on purpose to make a division. "I came not to send peace on earth, but a sword." He preached instantly and everywhere his new doctrine of repentance for the remission of sin till the veil of the temple was rent in twain; of the temple itself was not left one stone upon another, and the church of Jewry—the perfectly united church of sacrifice and altar and slain bullocks—was not only divided, but dissolved.

What of Paul? To him it was given to drive in the wedge constructed on Christ's principles—the most divisive wedge that ever threatened the integrity of an institution. It was not only theological, but political. It laid open to suspicion not only Paul's orthodoxy, but his patriotism. He defended both valiantly—the one by constant assertion that his new departure was only carrying out the teachings of the old prophets, the other by constant iteration of his loyalty to his country.

"I am a man which am a Jew, born in Tarsus, a city in Cilicia, a citizen of no mean city, brought up at the feet of Gamaliel, taught according to the perfect manner of the law of the fathers, as zealous toward God as ye all are at this day. Circumcised the eighth day, of the stock of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, an Hebrew of the Hebrews, as touching the law a Pharisee, concerning zeal persecuting the church, touching the righteousness which is in the law blameless." There is orthodoxy for you!

And before and after, and above and around, and through and through Paul's passionate protest that he and his Gentiles shall not be thrust back from the love of God, that they as well as the Jews are God's elect, justified in their claim by God himself, come flashing and fervid his equally passionate protests of patriotism. His claim of equal spiritual rights for foreigners, he will not suffer to be construed into indifference to his native land, her traditions, her institutions, her glory and her grace:

I say the truth in Christ, I lie not, my conscience also bearing me witness in the Holy Ghost that I have great heaviness and continual sorrow in my heart that my own people will not accept the gospel of Christ. For I could wish myself accursed from Christ for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh, who are Israelites, and of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came. No one supposes this to be cool and deliberate statement of fact. Every one sees that it is a fervid and sudden outburst of feeling. Accursed from Christ means to hate Christ, which for Paul was a contradiction in terms, and it is followed instantly by a subsidence into argument. But it serves to emphasize the question between Jew and Gentile. It shows Paul eager to fight for the rights of the Gentile to the benefit of Christianity, yet guarding himself at every point against hostility or lukewarmness

toward his own country. There is no difference, he is ready to maintain with his life, between the Jew and the Greek. "The same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon him"; but at the same time his heart's desire and prayer unto God is that Israel should be saved.

Is the unsettling of men's minds always to be deprecated? Never, unless they are settled right—which they never can be in this life, perhaps not in any. When volcanoes close and there are no more earthquakes, and the cyclone has ceased to sweep, and the freshets to overwhelm, it will be a settled earth, but it will be a dead earth.

Eighty or ninety years ago, says an antiquarian, there were, among others who might be mentioned, three ministers of Essex County, Massachusetts, mighty preachers of the Westminster doctrines, ardent, sagacious, and progressive Christians, foremost in founding Andover Seminary, the American Board, the American Tract Society, the American Education Society, and the Massachusetts Domestic Missionary Society. These were men who needed not to be ashamed, noted and admired at home and throughout the country.

The first was Dr. Samuel Spring of Newburyport, father of Dr. Gardner Spring, of New York city. In the forty-six years of his pastorate he received only one hundred and forty-seven to the church. In eighteen consecutive years he received but ten members. In twenty-two of the years he had no additions at all. The second was Elijah Parish, D. D., of Byfield, more noted, if possible, who, in the thirty-seven years of his ministry, admitted but one hundred and five to the church. In twenty-nine successive years there were but sixteen members added, and in twenty-seven of the thirty-seven years no additions at all. Rev. Leonard Woods was the third, afterward D. D. and Professor at Andover. He was ten

years pastor of the Second Church in West Newbury, during which time he received but fourteen members—ten by profession. And no church in Essex North, and perhaps few in New England, did better than these mentioned during the fifty years from 1775 to 1825.

These men at that time preached according to the Westminster Confession, and the Catechism was taught in every family and in the common schools. In a volume of admirable sermons by Dr. Parish, which doubtless well illustrates the style and scope of the preaching of these, the searcher fails to find in a single instance the love of God in Christ magnified, or the duty of sinners set forth to love and obey him, and to repent and consecrate themselves to him; or any preaching to the unconverted as such, as if he or they had any responsibility in the case. Dr. Woods was praised by one of his hearers, because he preached so much of God's sovereignty and the total insufficiency of all unregenerate exertions, and most of all because he had said: "When the devils were made, God meant they should be devils."

The doctrine of God's sovereignty as against man's free will is never touched by Paul; as a doctrine never at all. Both are assumed, as they have a right to be. Neither is susceptible of proof. Both are at the basis of reason. They underlie all Paul's argument, but he does not argue them. In practical affairs this is always done, and Paul was eminently practical. He gave his life to converting Gentiles and to convincing Jews that Gentiles had a right to be converted. He did not attempt to expound metaphysics. But he was not afraid of metaphysics. He never went out of his way either to explain or avoid it. But if a metaphysical theory promised to serve his purpose, he swung it around at full arm-sweep with the heartiest good-will, not caring though the whole thing went to pieces in the handling, if only he made his point.

The carefully constructed "system" of theology, with its elaborate and definite ramifications and interlacings and dovetailings between divine sovereignty and freedom of the will was not made by the Apostles, but by the later theologians—the Augustines, the Calvins, the Jonathan Edwardses. Paul had no theory. Paul's divine sovereignty and ours surrounds, envelopes, clasps, penetrates, sustains our free will as the atmosphere surrounds and sustains the earth. How could men wrap an ocean fifty miles deep around this earth without suffocating and crushing out all life? Yet so it is that an ocean wraps us around in which we are not suffocated or crushed; in which we live and move and have our being, in lack of which we could not live at all. Within us and without us—in the bounding blood, in the sensitive lungs, in the most capricious yet constant air—the delicate balance, the marvelous rhythmic life, is always preserved. Millions of beings do not know of the existence of an ocean of air, but they all breathe. We may not formulate the sovereignty of God, but we discover and do not invent the laws of nature, and we are conscious that within those laws we are as free as God. We are free with the freedom of God—will and choice.

It is surely a most curious twist of theological candor and ingenuity which makes Paul preach the opposite of his humane and liberal thought. He has passed through a looking-glass world. He taught that God would not confine himself to the Jews, but was Father of the Gentiles also; and men have bejuggled it into a wicked doctrine that God would save or damn his creatures as he pleased. Paul taught that God would save as many as he wished to save, and we render it that he will damn as many as he wishes to damn. Paul preached that God would not pass by or reprobate the Gentiles, and we Gentiles turn upon him and say that he shall.

God says: "I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy. Even when I say unto the wicked, Thou shalt die, if he turn from his sin, he shall surely live! He shall not die." Presbytery says: "Not so, Lord! Thou must stand by thy word, and thy word shall be what I say it is. When I think that thou predestinest men to everlasting death, they are unchangeably designed and their number can not be increased or diminished."

But if we knock this all away, what have we left as a deposit of faith?

What have we if we do not knock it away? A God all-powerful, all-willful, arbitrary and irresponsible, creating man with reason yet withholding from him reasons, demanding man's prompt decision and allegiance, yet presenting himself to man as a God utterly capricious, infinitely cruel, and sheltering himself from man's spirited and just remonstrance behind a bulwark of *unsearchability*. We have a terrible game of hide-and-seek, with eternal death for the forfeit and with the odds heavily against the man.

And we have a beautifully-balanced, perfectly-adjusted theological "system."

If we let the "system" fall to pieces, what have we left? A God all-powerful, only a part of whose ways we know, only a part of whose plan we can make out, but whose tender mercies are over all his works. A God in whose unsearchability all men may take shelter, but behind whose unsearchability no man can hide. A God who made man, but made him for righteousness. A God who will by no means clear the guilty, but who is forever showing the guilty how to clear himself, and showing him that it is not by slain beasts or by burnt incense, but by repenting and forsaking sin and thus making his soul clean. A God sending his beloved Son into the world not to condemn the world, but that through him the world might

be saved; that, seeing God in Christ more clearly, men might love God as seen in Christ through faith in him and the righteousness that comes by such faith; that men might be buoyed up by the hope of his resurrection and purified and *unselfed* by fellowship with his sufferings. A God who desires men to worship him, not because his self-conceit demands to be inflated by man's adulation, but because he is the eternal righteousness, the ideal of self-sacrifice lavishing himself forever on his creatures, and therefore worship of him is alike the measure and means of man's enlightenment.

Progress is slow; at any one present moment it seems to be no progress; but, looking back to the far beginning, we can discern and define the glacial movement of humanity from the arctic rigors of moral ignorance and darkness toward the summer of eternal life.

## CHAPTER VIII.

### SPIRITUAL HEAT CONSIDERED AS A MODE OF MOTION.

THAT mental and moral, rhythmic and regular, inward and inspired, eternal movement which was felt upon earth when the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters; which stirred in humanity in its first aspiration toward the God from whom humanity came; which impelled Abraham to leave the worship of idols in Ur of the Chaldees and go up in the worship of the true God to Canaan; which impelled Paul to abandon the worship of God by the slaughter of sheep and goats for the worship of God by repentance and faith in Christ; which impelled Luther to break with the church of authority and priestly mediation, and establish the church of reason, under one mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus—is the same mental and moral movement which has impelled the Presbyterian church to-day to attempt the revision of its creed, the same movement which is represented in the Congregational churches as The New Departure. It is thus, as we see, no new departure. It is as old as history. It is as old as humanity. Yet rightly is it, also, a new departure, for it *is* new every morning and fresh every evening—new as our orisons, fresh as our vespers, new as the old sun swells newly in every blossom of every spring.

Although Congregationalism is here in a very small, not to say minute, minority, it is not impertinent to

notice the Congregational movement, because, although it is local, it is part of a movement that is general.

There can be no revision of the creed in the Congregational church because there is no Congregational church. Every church is an independent body and makes its own creed. Congregational churches unite in councils, but these councils are not authoritative; only advisory. The new departures of Congregationalism show chiefly in bodies organized by its churches for some special purpose; as in the American Board organized for foreign missionary work, and in the Andover Seminary organized for the training of men into clergymen. The former is supported by the contributions of the churches; the latter chiefly by a church fund. Over both the fight waxes hot this moment in the North. Over the latter the contention is so sharp that it is called by that ancient radicalism which has become the conservatism of to-day —the Andover scandal. This has a bad sound, but it is really no worse than the Paul-and-Barnabas scandal or the Paul-and-Peter scandal, which were settled not only amicably, but advantageously. If you remember, when Paul and Barnabas designed to go on a tour of inspection from Antioch, Barnabas determined to take with them his nephew, Mark. Perhaps it would have been more courteous in Barnabas to consult Paul before determining who should be admitted to the intimacy of being their traveling companion, and perhaps private secretary. But it is very possible that Barnabas had reasons for suspecting that Paul did not wish Mark to go, and therefore Barnabas concluded not to run the risk of refusal, but to take Mark and say nothing about it. But Paul was not to be so easily disposed of. He did not hesitate to refuse before he was asked. He thought not good to take with them one who departed from them from Pamphylia and went not with them to the work. Barnabas, forced into

the open opposition which he was no doubt anxious to avoid, stood up bravely for his sister's son ; and the contention was so sharp between them that the whole plan was broken up. Paul took his man and went one way, and Barnabas took his man and went another.

Everything indicates that Paul was wrong. The trouble hinged upon the departure of Mark from Pamphylia. We are not told the reason. The journey was long and labored, partly by sea. Mark might have been ill, or homesick, or seasick—but whatever it was, Paul thought the reason trivial, and one that made Mark untrustworthy. Perhaps Paul himself was a little piqued. At any rate, Paul was in the wrong. He ought to have known Mark's character better. Mark's mother's house was the first one Peter sought after his release from prison ; and when he got there he found them all praying for him, which speaks well for Mark's upbringing. When Paul preached in sea-born Salamis, the delegation had Mark for their minister, which shows him true to his mother's faith. Afterward Paul himself, a prisoner in Rome, wrote a letter of recommendation for Mark, speaking of him in the highest terms as "my fellow-worker into the kingdom of God, who has been a comfort unto me," showing that Paul had discovered that Mark was trustworthy, and that there had been a complete reconciliation between them and a return to cordial companionship.

For us Mark's certificate of character is the honor of the authorship of the second gospel, or so great a prominence in the early Church that his name is indissolubly connected with it ; but if it was worth while to send down through the centuries the record of what was only a little tiff between two eminent and admirable men over a third, who became scarcely less eminent and admirable, we can afford to give one Sunday hour to a dissension—even some-

times a dissension heated to the Pauline point—founded on the moral expansiveness of the human soul.

In further guidance of our own conduct we may also observe that when Peter came to Antioch and betrayed his Master a second time, carrying all the fearsome with him, insomuch that Barnabas also was carried away with their dissimulation, Paul threw himself into the breach instantly and openly. This time undoubtedly Barnabas was wrong; but he was wrong with Peter, which made it almost what politicians call a "bolt." However, he did not say, with conscientious old-school Presbyterians in the creed discussions, "If I oppose Peter it will draw party lines which it may take years to obliterate. It is not a good thing for friends to be fighting each other when the enemy is attacking the citadel." On the contrary, Paul thought that decidedly the best way to conduct a war is to secure fidelity to the cause and harmony of action inside the fort first; and he withstood Peter to the face before them all,—as we do this day!

The Andover scandal, then, as I understand it, is this: The president and professors of the Theological Seminary at Andover are charged with teaching as orthodoxy what they have sworn to regard as heterodoxy. The conservatives, do not plead that the new departure or its essence, "future probation," is false, but that it is not what the founders of Andover Seminary pledged the professors to teach. To the outside world, therefore, it appears to be simply a question of common honesty. Old orthodoxy, say the Gallios, who really care nothing about orthodoxy, old or new—old orthodoxy is absurd, but, as the Andover professors have sworn to teach it, they ought to teach it or go; teach it, or give up the Andover fund on which the school was founded. And some of the conservative clergymen who do care for old orthodoxy characterize the action of president and professors as

"the most stupendous breach of trust of a century not unmarked by such crimes."

The laity do not, perhaps, go so far as the clergy. The laity impute no breach of trust to the Andover professors; on the contrary, pronounce them eminently honorable, able, upright, conscientious Christian men, but mistaken in their position.

Judge Hoar compared the case to that of an English landlady who would not allow a heathen boarder to sacrifice a bull to Jupiter in her back parlor. She did not forbid freedom of thought, but her back parlor was no place for its indulgence in that peculiar form. So, argued Judge Hoar, the Andover Seminary is no place to teach even the doctrines of the Christian religion, if those doctrines are inconsistent with the Andover Creed. I suppose Judge Hoar could hardly find anything more inconsistent with his idea of the doctrines of the Christian religion than his idea of the doctrines of the Andover creed.

In like manner, the daily papers express probably a wide-spread lay opinion when they affirm that there are very many laymen who do not coincide with the complainants' theological opinions who yet agree with them to this extent: that whether the Andover creed itself is theologically sound or not, the trust by which the seminary is mainly supported demands strict adherence to the letter of the creed; and for the sake of perfect honesty, therefore, and as an example of the fulfillment of the letter of an obligation, much needed in these days, it would be better that further enjoyments of those old bequests should cease than that the slightest suspicion of their perversion should go forth to the world at large.

This is a phase of the question to which too little attention has been paid, and which is certainly indispensable to a fair understanding of the conservative side of the controversy.

All this constitutes the Andover scandal as well it may. A stupendous breach of trust is, or ought to be, not merely an ecclesiastical, but a penitentiary question.

The "Andover Fuss" is what it was called forty years ago. Seeming only an ecclesiastical quarrel about a non-practical point, it is the successive bursting of burs that marks the ripening of successive kernels of truth. And while the kernel must ripen or the fruit of the tree of life fail, it should not be forgotten that the bur does vital work in holding fast the precious seed till moved by the internal and eternal force to loosen its lifelong grasp.

But while the drama is the same, the actors have changed—some in person, some in parts. The villain of the last generation has become the hero of this. Professor Park in particular is gathering up the weeds and grass and stones that were flung at him forty years ago, and is shying them at President Smyth with as hearty a good will as if he did not know exactly how they could hit and not hurt.

The contention was so sharp between Paul and Barnabas that they snapped apart. The contention is so sharp between new Andover and old orthodoxy that they have grappled.

"Dare any of you," says Paul, sternly, "having a matter against another, to go to law before the unjust and not before the saints?"

And a very considerable and a very respectable coterie of Congregationalists in Massachusetts reply: "Yes, we dare," and betake themselves with their Andover disputation to the Supreme Court.

It is not to be assumed that the Supreme Court of Massachusetts is unjust, nor do I understand that Paul meant to accuse the courts of Corinth of injustice. But they were heathen and did not know or care for the ties which bound together the early Christians. The Su-

preme Court are lawyers, and, as lawyers, not concerned with questions of theology.

But it is not theology, claim these Congregationalists. It is not the theological or metaphysical aspect of the question which brings it before the courts. It is the moral aspect. Men who hold no opinion on the covenant of the redemption, who do not know the difference between Hopkinsianism and Grand Llamaism, who could not define the federal headship of Adam to save their own heads, have yet a clear conviction that whatever Hopkinsianism may be, the man who says he will teach it ought to teach it ; and if he takes the money that was devoted to its teaching, and with that money teaches something else, it would pass for pretty sharp practice on Wall Street, whatever it may be called in Andover.

And in proof that a brother offended is harder to be won than a strong city of foes, see how tenderly we deal with the forth-putting of Presbyterian new-departure revisionists, while we appeal to law as well as gospel to unseat our new-departure Andover professors. Says a Congregational official, conservative of the conservatives : "There is a great deal said just now in certain quarters about our Presbyterian friends, and the restiveness which they are thought to exhibit under the Westminster formulæ, which still, theoretically, mold all their opinions. And the accusation has not been unmade that there is an inherent and inevitable falseness in every pretense on the part of a Presbyterian pastor of to-day to answer affirmatively the 'questions' asked at his ordination, which ought to be so repugnant as to be impossible to an honest man. The second of these questions is this : 'Do you sincerely receive and adopt the Westminster Confession and Catechisms as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures ?' And reference is especially had to the divine ordination of the non-elect 'to

dishonor and wrath'; to the positive guilt of original, previous to actual sin; and to other portions which it is said that nobody now believes. Yet it is insisted that the Presbyterian ministry keep on solemnly declaring that they believe them, and will preach them—doing neither.

"Now, the fact that there is a movement for revision does surely indicate that there is some truth in the claim. Yet we have no idea that it could be fair to insist that our Presbyterian brethren who believe and teach just as other evangelical people do, on all these points under question, are guilty of any inward falseness in the matter. The fact is that—in common with all thinking and sensible men—they hold their faith in the only way in which they can hold it, in that reasonable aspect which has been shaped in their minds by the force and pressure of the whole world of Christian thought. For substance of doctrine they hold it.

"So long as they remain true to the central and essential idea which characterizes their system, they are honest men, and uncensurable."

Thus far it is all a commendable Christian liberality; but here comes the "little dig" at Andover, for whose sweet, pungent sake I half suspect it is that so much consideration is folded around these Presbyterian lapses! "Did they get their living from funds founded expressly to secure the perpetual teaching of those Westminster doctrines, and did they actually teach doctrines from which the Westminster men would have shrunk with horror, that would be another question."

That is, you may preach not exactly what you believe, but what other people preach, and be an honest man—if you preach on a yearly salary; but if you preach thus on an established fund—why, that is another question. You may hold your faith in the only way you *can* hold it—reasonably, sensibly, substantially, essentially—

if you are only a Presbyterian minister. But if you are an Andover professor, you must hold it as you can not hold it—unreasonably, punctiliously, as no thinking and sensible men do! Else you are guilty of a breach of trust and an Andover scandal.

Ex-Professor Phelps, of Andover, father of a clearer theological insight than his own,* goes even beyond his conservative comrades. He will not admit the test of a lawsuit. Even if new Andover has the law, he says, honor should restrain them. "Should it be sufficient for honorable men if, in law, the liberty they are assuming can not be rebuked? Should it even content them that the Supreme Court of Massachusetts would not remove them from their chairs?" He considers it mere hardihood to think that the founders would have approved the faith of the Andoverians if it had been imported in their day, and, therefore, the professors should make it a point of honor not to teach it, although the creed says nothing about it.

So far as this is to the point, the question is not whether, if the new theology had been taken back a hundred years, the founders would have accepted it, but whether, if the founders were brought forward a hundred years, they would not accept it. To this, one could unhesitatingly answer Yes, because they accepted the best light of their day, as their heirs and assigns accept the best light of to-day.

A young lady was visiting in Andover not long since, and in the course of conversation with the emeritus professor, is said to have been asked by him how *she* would like it if she left money to pay for instruction in French in a particular institution, and a professor supported by

---

.* In the yesterdays, when this was written. To-day alas! on earth is no vision so clear as his whom the heaven has received.

her endowment should teach German instead. Her reply was that she should not like it at all, but she should certainly expect that the professor would teach *French as it was spoken at the time.* The learned ex-professor smiled, said that he had not been fortunate in his choice of an illustration, and passed to another topic of conversation.

Ex-Professor Park, of Andover—forty years a radical, pushed by the conservatives, now in turn a conservative, pushing the radicals—is so brilliant, so pungent, so roguish, so extraordinarily clever, that he must know better. When he gibes at the "moral integrity" of Andover and "the new Andover ethics," it must be an intellectual caper. Time-stained pamphlets, exhumed from boxes beneath the eaves, still glitter with the sarcasm, are moist with the tears, and red hot with the wrath evoked by the derelictions of Professor Park when he presided over the seminary whose head has been cut off, although it refuses to roll into the basket. Every charge of breach of trust, logical inconsistency, dangerous error brought against President Smyth to-day was brought against Professor Park forty years ago. All that is not appalling is amusing in the spectacle of this heretic of the last generation, absolutely forgetting those things which are behind and reaching forth unto the heretic of to-day with the same unwieldy blunderbusses that fired their vain volleys at him. That it is a holy war does not prevent the tactics from being grotesque.

In their time the old formulas did good service, but the world moves—moves in the evolution of religious truth just as really and rapidly as in the evolution of material truth. Flint and steel marked a momentous invention. The doctrine of election, in politics and in theology, was a great advance over hereditary transmission of saving grace and sovereign power. But to take the doctrine of election out of history and present it to

the world as a nugget of unrelated truth is just as absurd as it would be to declare flint and steel the one divinely appointed method of kindling the domestic hearth.

Then, as now, the piece of toughest resistance was the Westminster Catechism. "If there are words in the English language which can make anything plain," protested the remonstrants against Professor Park in 1849, "the founders have made plain and undeniable their intention that the doctrines of the Assembly's Catechism, and no other, should be maintained, defended, and propagated through the instrumentality of their seminary." But, under Professor Park's deft hand, original sin and other related doctrines prove to be an altogether different grist from that which came out of the Westminster hopper. Just as heretic Smyth is charged with the "stupendous crime" of breach of trust, the beloved Park aiding and abetting the charge, so did the world, the flesh, and the devil charge at Professor Park in 1853. "How can the professor reconcile his position with the principles of moral integrity? On the one hand, distinct and explicit declarations of doctrinal belief, and pledges to teach in accordance therewith, and, on the other hand, a course of teaching apparently contrary. There must rest a painful feeling of misgiving, lest in his ardent love and pursuit of philosophical speculations he may have forgotten what is due to those high principles of uprightness which ought so manifestly to govern all the professors in the seminary that every question respecting it should be wholly precluded!"

Is that of 1853 or 1890?

Professor Park is of too large a nature to lay to heart little grievances of this sort. In his noble forgetfulness he now declares that if an official doubt of his allegiance to the creed had ever been intimated, "I should have re-

garded the intimation as an insult to me and as an implied charge of prevarication!"

"I am afraid," said President Lincoln to a friendly judge who was giving an account of his proceedings at the nominating convention, "I am afraid, there, you prevaricated a little."

"Prevaricate!" cried the too ardent judge; "I lied like ——!"

Beyond and above any crime charged upon Professor Smyth, this conservative of to-day but inconoclast of yesterday was accused of having repeatedly stamped the articles that he rejected "with ridicule and exposed them to public scorn." And I am afraid he did. I am sure that when he saw the bur splitting it was not in him to press it together, but rather to join forces with the interior expanding truth and hasten its release by the keen thrusts of his playful and polished but powerful wit.

On the face of it, those theological Forty-niners had Professor Park on the hip exactly as Professor Park has President Smyth on the hip now. Each alike had to avow on the day of his inauguration, and, to prevent a subsequent breaking away, every five years thereafter, his faith in the Westminster Catechism.

To prove Professor Park's heresy, the remonstrants quoted from his sermons such words of wisdom and righteousness as make the yellow pages of my garret rubbish thrill with living fire. Why is Professor Park training in the old camp when his own words show that he belongs to the new departure, falsely so called? Egbert Smyth never struck a truer note, never gave a clearer exposition of the proper method of Bible interpretation and the common errors of exegesis, than does Professor Park in these heretical and heaven-taught sermons. Every page is crowded with truth, discrimination, the all-compelling eloquence of lucidity. It is inexplicable that his oppo-

nents did not yield to their force at once. It is inexplicable that pulpits should still be found preaching the dead and petrified method of interpretation when, for these forty years and more, Professor Park has been so illuminating the living way. It is a freak of nature that Professor Park himself, in his vigorous and magnificent age, should turn upon Professor Smyth for following in the footsteps of his splendid and stirring prime.

Professor Park is the most brilliant as well as the most delightful man in the world. He is always brimming over with mischief—using the word "for true heart, and not for harm." It must be that as his work is well done he can not help playing. Walking up and down the beautiful greenery, wherein, like gems, are set his house and all the saints' houses and haunts of the Andover school of the prophets, he spies President Smyth, remote, unfriended, melancholy, gliding out from the shadows of Brechan Hall; and instantly grabs a wisp of "speculations" and handfuls of "moral integrity" and "German rationalism" and lets fly at him for pure fun, as who should say: "See here, young man, if you think it is a fine thing to step into my shoes and be a progressive theologian instead of a stationary one, take this—and this —and this, and see how you like it!"

Just as unprogressive theology casts longing glances back from the aggressive incursions of present thought to the good old times when Professor Park held fast the form of sound doctrine, so did the stationary of the last generation bemoan themselves for the golden age of the good Dr. Woods, when the Westminster Catechism was in its glory of unquestioned supremacy. The doctrine of original sin, including the personal guilt of each and every individual of the human race, in all successive ages to the end of time for its commission; and the just desert of and liability to everlasting punishment in hell, by one

and all of the posterity of Adam, for their violation of the law of God imputed to them as their own transgression, *done by them in him*, their antecedent representative and covenant head—this good old wholesale doctrine, not whittled down by reason, but officially guarded and transmitted by Professor Park's model predecessor, Dr. Woods —this doctrine the remonstrants of 1849 declared to be the touchstone of New England orthodoxy. No doubt a great host outside of New England orthodoxy will agree with them and gloat over it with unseemly mirth.

But I, who gather within myself the strictness of eight generations of New England orthodoxy, am justified therein by finding that Dr. Woods says nothing of the sort. Dr. Woods, so far from setting his hand and seal to such irrationalism, left on record a theology worthy of his grandson, the late Rev. Dr. John Cotton Smith, beloved and lamented rector of the Church of the Ascension in New York ; worthy of the gracious presence and noble promise of his great-grandson, late the youthful rector of the Church of St. Peter in Beverly, Massachusetts, and now holding up the right hand of Phillips Brooks in Boston ; worthy even of his great-great-grandson, the most reverend of all, John Cotton Smith, of the Church of the Holy Innocents, whose theology is yet undefined, but was certified by the Redeemer of the world as entitling him to the Kingdom of Heaven. Dr. Woods, who preached so powerfully and so unsuccessfully the divine sovereignty in the creation of devils with fore-knowledge that they would be and fore-will that they should be devils ; Dr. Woods, reared in New England and educated in her most ancient college, for many years the only theological professor in her only theological seminary—rose as spokesman for his brethren and loudly proclaimed : "Every attempt which has been made to prove that God ever imputes to man any sinful disposition or act which

is not strictly his own has failed of success. . . . I say, with the utmost frankness, that we *are not entirely satisfied with the language used on this subject in the Assembly's Catechism.* Though we hold that catechism, taken as a whole, in the highest estimation, we could not with a good conscience subscribe to every expression it contains in relation to the doctrine of original sin. Hence *it is common* for us, when we declare our assent to the catechism, *to do it with an express or implied restriction.* We receive the catechism *generally* as containing a summary of the principles of Christianity. But that the sinfulness of our natural fallen state consists, in any measure, in the guilt of Adam's first sin is what *we can not admit.*" And seven times afterward did he loudly repeat that he subscribed to the Westminster Catechism in general and denied it in particular. And all the people said Amen! It is idle to talk of anything dishonest or sinister in a proceeding so open.

Here, then, we have the striking spectacle of a group of solid New England Christians conscientiously striving to oust President Smyth because he can not keep step on the creed with Professor Park; and we go back thirty years and find another group of saintly men trying just as hard to oust Professor Park because he could not keep step with Dr. Woods on the catechism, and we go back thence twenty years, and find that Dr. Woods made no pretense of keeping step at all. He made the march right loyally, but he deliberately proclaimed from his mountain-top, the wide world over, that the catechism was often out of time, and that he and his comrades had no scruple in marching to their own music.

Professor Park finds that President Smyth has softened down the everlasting penalty of the creed into everlasting possibility, and Dr. Dana mourned that Professor Park had softened down the original sin of the catechism into

a "series of intense expressions." But Dr. Woods, to whom we are directed as the standard, made short work of both creed and catechism, and taught the common-sense doctrine that original sin is the sin that originates with every man. Why must President Smyth shut out all the light let in by Professor Park in the last generation, and by Dr. Woods in the preceding generation, and contract his pupils to the gray twilight of Westminster Abbey?

When Professor Park reminds the Andover trustees that they "have a sacred responsibility for the theological character of the seminary" against President Smyth's heterodoxies, he must remember that when he was president fifty years ago the trustees of that day were just as solemnly warned against him; were bidden by the conservatives to remember that "both he and they are accountable to a higher tribunal, where *evasions, limitations*, and *mental reservations* are of no avail." By these evasions, limitations, and mental reservations they meant Professor Park; and the very things to which they gave these ugly names were some of the very best and soundest and most enduring points of his theology!

With a charming, not to say jolly, boyishness, the octogenarian professor maintains that President Smyth can not subscribe to the Andover creed without having been thoroughly ashamed of himself when he made his declaration of faith in public, and without being again thoroughly ashamed of himself at every successive period of five years, when he renews it.

But Dr. Park must surely remember the glee with which he used to describe himself and his brother professors as marching up every five years to swear that they were not any wiser than they had been five years before! He must recall the charges which were flung at him fifty years ago—charges of inconsistency in signing the creed

while he was "evading the definition of the atonement"; charges of teaching "a religion manifestly false and absurd as well as dangerous and destructive—in other words, anything but Christianity." Does he recall that he was ever ashamed of himself for it? I think if Professor Park would lay his hand on his heart and tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, he would say that he gloried in it!

He denounces the rationalistic drift of Andover, protesting that the founders "could never have been persuaded to endow a seminary which would drop one article of its creed at every fresh arrival of a German steamer." His own critics of his early days could not be so witty, but they were not less sensible of the breach of trust and misappropriation of funds involved in what they called his "polished and frigid rationalism." He declares that of all the orthodox seminaries in the United States, "there is not one which is so firmly bound to resist the new movement as is the seminary at Andover." Just so the earnest old fathers of 1853 warned the same seminary authorities that if they would "persist in supporting Professor Park they would be guilty of such violation of duty and responsibility as rests upon no similar band of trustees in the land." He maintains stoutly that if President Smyth has any right to his "professor's chair," "then it is time to dispense with the English language"; for the men of the new departure, he cries aloud, "are revolutionizing the English language as well as the Andover creed." Just as desperate a raid upon his own use of the English language made they of the old time, though with more Grandisonian and complimentary personal reference. "He is in direct conflict with the catechism to which he has promised to conform in all his theological teachings. We are aware that he is extremely skillful in the use of language, and that many strong

phrases have yielded much of their meaning, when couched in his pliant and beautiful forms of illustration; but the stubborn English of the Assembly's Catechism is proof against the enchantments of his brilliant but deceitful rhetoric."

Professor Park insists that the main spirit of the new departure is antagonistic to the main spirit of the Andover creed in its relation to the doctrines of total depravity, the atonement, and future punishment; but, by a singular parallelism, when he was Abbott professor, his critics claimed that his theory was "a complete denial of native depravity," that he "mollified the doctrine of original sin," and that his "notion of the atonement was evasive, extremely vague, and unsatisfactory!"

Better than Judge Hoar, better than the Supreme Court of Massachusetts, Professor Park knows how little and how much there is in the clamor for President Smyth's removal, in the cry against his honesty—and that is, nothing at all.

When Dr. Woods was gathered to his fathers, and Dr. Park reigned in his stead, he struck the old truths with so direct and so forcible a blow that the shower of sparks seemed the illumination of a new departure, and people who had done up their minds in camphor and did not wish to open and air and use them any more, tried to save themselves all mental trouble by dismissing him from the seminary. But neither would the seminary dismiss him, nor would he be dismissed, but stood up stoutly for *his* total depravity and *his* views of future punishment and original sin, declaring that "when a theorist seizes at the living words of the Bible and puts them into his vise, and straightens or crooks them into the dogma that man is blamable before he chooses to do wrong, deserving of punishment for the involuntary nature which he has never consented to gratify, really sinful before he actu-

ally sins, then the language of emotion, forced from its right place and treated as if it were a part of a nicely measured syllogism, hampers and confuses his reasonings, until it is given back to the use for which it was first intended and from which it never ought to have been diverted."

Professor Park is my very dear friend, or, if that be presuming, I am his most ardent admirer; and when a man has held up the candle of the Lord as high and bright as he has done, it is not for us to chide, though the apostle of sweetness and light does for a moment forget his own illumination and not only tries to thrust President Smyth's candle under a bushel, but to sit on the bushel!

Conservative orthodoxy, liberal Christianity, secular common sense, and ultra radicalism unite in condemning the Andover professors, declaring that they are not to be justified in their claim that they have a right under the creed to teach their doctrines. Nevertheless, the Andover professors are right, and all the others are wrong. If the Andover professors should give up the contest and withdraw from the seminary, they would be guilty of a breach of the trust confided to them by the founders. It is not necessarily stupid in outside circles to misunderstand the case, but it is not wise to pronounce upon it until it is understood, and it can not be understood without attention to the meaning, the use, and the weight of words. We are so accustomed to speak words with a hop, and read them with a skip, and pronounce judgment upon them with a jump, that when important issues are involved we rush wildly astray.

The struggle is not, as the world assumes, over the acceptance of the creed, but over the interpretation of the creed, just as the struggle in the Church to-day is not over the acceptance of the Bible but over the interpreta-

tion of the Bible. The present professors accept the creed. The outside world says they ought not to accept it. Must the professors, the modern experts, the men who have made the creed the study of their life—must they relinquish it actually or constructively because the editors, the lawyers, the pastors, and the previous generation of experts think they ought? That is, must a man guide his life by his own conscience and consciousness or by other persons'? The founders of Andover prescribed only that professors should accept and teach the creed. They did not prescribe how it should be interpreted. The professors swear that they do accept and teach it. Who shall say them nay?

Old orthodoxy charges that they interpret it so differently from the founders that it amounts to a rejection of the creed; and that they yet persist in using—nay, even "affect" to use—the old-fashioned terms. Mr. Charles Voysey, transferring to the extreme left that mental quality which on the extreme right is called bigotry, says:

"They scandalously and with intellectual fraud try to foist a new meaning into the old horrible Christian phrases, a meaning the exact opposite of the hitherto accepted sense. I reject these miserable subterfuges . . . because the process of interpretation is fraudulent."

But the new theology is right in refusing to sacrifice to the old one single word. To the truth it is willing to sacrifice all words, to falsehood none. If human fallibility for a thousand years has given a false meaning to a phrase, the new theology has still a divine right to throw out the false meaning and restore the true. The truth has no statute of limitations. The truth does not lose proprietorship in a formula because falsehood has been an unhindered tenant for centuries.

The right to retain the old words is inalienable. What as to the wisdom?

There can be no greater difference between the old theology and the new than there was between the Mosaic theology and the Christian theology. As we have seen, the Christian system involved the complete overthrow of priesthood, temple, altar, sacrifice; the whole system not only, but the very structure of Jewish worship. The clever and learned Pharisees, scribes, doctors of the law saw this clearly. The conservatives of that day and city were not so polite, so self-restrained, so moderate as our conservatives at Des Moines and Springfield and Andover and Minneapolis, and they protested against the new theology to the point of mobs and scourge and crucifixion for the new theologian; and all the while to their charges he constantly protested: "Thinkest thou I am come to destroy the law and the prophets? I am not come to destroy but to fulfill."

How could he honestly say that? He preached a religion which not only has subverted, but which was intended to subvert the whole Jewish ritual, the priests who administered it, the temple in which it was performed. Must there not rest upon all minds a painful misgiving that Christ, for love of a quiet life and fear of opposition, may have forgotten those high principles of uprightness which Dr. Dana of old times inculcated upon Professor Park, and which Professor Park in his turn enjoins upon Professor Smyth? Does not Christ incur the suspicion of intellectual fraud in putting a new meaning into the old words?

But Christ saw further, deeper, keener, wider than the Pharisees, and he spoke, as he had a right to speak, from his own broad vision and not from their narrow one. They saw the destruction in his teachings, but not the construction. He had not come to destroy the law. He had come to fulfill the very object for which the law had been originally established.

It is true that this fulfillment involved the destruction of the law, but this destruction was not the object of his coming, and, still more and vitally to the purpose, it was not such destruction as the Pharisees apprehended, by force from without, but a gentle dissolution by inward necessity—a natural, healthy, and painless absorption. The object of the law was to establish communication between man and his Maker for his own upbuilding in righteousness. Christ came to bring a more perfect communication, and the more perfect must in time disestablish the less perfect. Man had built a hard and even a hateful and cumbrous way to God—a way of burnt-offerings and brutal slaughter and costly temple and ceremonial priest. Christ came to say: "I am the way"—the way of love—that potent alembic in which rite and violence and selfishness should be forever dissolved. Christ destroyed the law as day destroys the dawn.

The great apostles wrought in the same spirit. They did not tear down the old as a necessary preparation for building the new on a mechanical theory of ecclesiasticism. They proceeded on the spiritual theory and developed the new out of everything that was eternal in the old; and not only on the old of the Mosaic law, but on the old of the pagan nations as well. Indeed, it was Paul's boast that he became all things to all men. Whoever wrote the Epistle to the Hebrews employed the tactics of infusing the Gospel of Christ into the Hebrew law. We have seen that he did not preach, "Abolish your priesthood, throw down your altars, burn your temples, they are outgrown." He said: "Christ is your high priest forever. We also have an altar, and to do good is its sacrifice." He did not scornfully repudiate the centuries-old covenant of Abraham, so dear to the Jews, calling it a clumsy and imperfect make-shift. He directed atten-

tion to the better covenant in Christ; that the divine law should be written on better than tables of stone—in their minds and in their hearts.

By the same tactics, when Paul was giving his charge to Timothy there was an utter change of policy. No beating about the bush, no careful deference to long associations, no cautious verbal manipulation. He went straight and swift to the mark: "There is one mediator between God and men—the man Christ Jesus, Blessed and only Potentate, King of Kings and Lord of Lords, who only hath immortality." We have not a word about altar or sacrifice, but short, sharp, and decisive: "Let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity." Paul was careful of his beloved son's stomach and he was careful of his own cloak; but he did not take the smallest pains to walk softly over Timothy's ecclesiastical prejudices. He had himself educated that young man, and knew that he had no right to have any.

But when he left his well-beloved Timothy and addressed the stranger Athenians he was again all suavity and tact and consideration, addressing them not with Hebrew metaphor any more than with the Timothean *brusquerie*, but with the Greek technique. Just as he had poured his gospel into Hebrew forms for the Hebrews, so now he poured it into Greek forms at Athens, knowing that the forms were temporal and frangible, but the gospel is eternal. As he had talked of high priest and sacrifice to the Jews, he now talked of Zeus and poetry to the Greeks, declaring unto them not the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, whom they would have perhaps despised, but the God to whom their own altars were erected and of whom their own poets sung. And, be it observed, Paul apparently selected the only one of all the altars of Athens that *could* be upreared to the supreme God. It required a robust logic, but Paul was

equal to it. I greatly fear that old Orthodoxy would have thought Paul was double-dealing, and I am not sure that Professor Park would not have adjured him to *say* that he was an idolater if he *was* an idolater; and no doubt Mr. Voysey would have cried out upon the "miserable subterfuge" if he had been on Mars' Hill that day. But Paul stoutly asserted and maintained his right to speak his own way.

From our day prophet, priest, and king have passed. The words have no living meaning for us. Even with the Roman Catholic church, priest, altar, sacrifice are merely symbolic. No smell of blood is found, no bleating of lambs is heard in a Catholic cathedral any more than in a Protestant meeting-house. If Paul were preaching to us, he would not represent Christ as a sacrifice. He would say to us as to Timothy: "Let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity."

Therefore, when the Andover creed orders its professors to declare that Christ, as our redeemer, executeth the office of prophet, priest, and king; when Professor Park apportions the work of Christ by lot to the various functions of the Jewish priesthood, they are guilty of—what? An anachronism. Nothing more. They are speaking as old Jews instead of American republicans. They are emphasizing the temporary, the already vanished part of the Hebrew teaching Now that the Jewish ritual has for us completely passed away, all this terminology has for us only a historical, not a vital meaning. We have no such officer as prophet, priest, or king. All these offices were merged in Christ so long ago that the words themselves are merely literary. Everything on that theme was said centuries ago, when Paul faced the past with a gospel which was to supplant them all. What needs to be hammered into *us* is what Paul said, front-

ing the future: "Let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity."

But the literary and moral sense these words still have. In that sense they are wholly true. Nothing has ever put into them a single element of falseness. Every good thing which prophet, priest, or king was supposed to do or actually did for the Hebrews, that Christ came to do for all the world.. If I were to frame a creed I should not put in the Hebraistic clause, but I could subscribe to the Hebraistic clause in any creed whatever.

There is a pretty little rhymed theology lisped by very little folk—Frazeor, and Edward, and Meriel, and Charlotte, and Stanwood:

> "Where did you get your eyes so blue?"
> "Out of the sky as I came through."

As a scientific biogenesis this Socratic creed may leave something to be desired; but it expresses the Bible truth—the truth which, by exclusion, is thus far the established truth of science, that life is from God; and it teaches this truth to the child by a pointed, definite, and *remembrable* statement.

Nay, further. It is not only that the baby soul could know nothing of hereditary transmission, but the scientist who knows all that man knows of heredity knows no more than the little child, where did you get your eyes so blue.

From your father? No, the father's eyes are black. From your grandfather, then? No, the grandfather retains his own eyes blue and bright. The scientist is profoundly ignorant. Heredity is but ignorance writ large. The sage knows no more than baby the principle on which baby's eyes are blue and baby's brother's eyes are black. It is only that so the Hidden and Absolute Force wrought it out in the eternal order; and so the baby prattles a great truth with innocent lips.

We should not frame a creed saying:

I believe that children are the gift of God, and that the blue of their clear eyes is painted on their passage through the earth's atmosphere. But if the little children had made themselves into a Christian society to help each other to be kind and true, I could with good conscience sign even such a creed. I could sign it for substance of doctrine, fully believing that all souls are born of God and partake of the divine nature; and I could sign it for scientific truth if I were challenged. For, as the human body is demonstrably composed of ninety-five parts water and all parts earth, and as the earth's atmosphere is largely composed of water, it must be that the baby's blue eyes are gathered from the earthy materials and chiefly from the watery atmosphere of the planet on which it lives and from which its tiny body is composed! The only creed one could not sign would be a creed precluding the order of nature. This creed would simply give the order of nature, the divine order, under a figure which the childish mind could follow. Therefore, when the innocents lift their sweet voices in devout inquiry: "Where did you get your eyes so blue?" loudest and firmest shall ring my voice with theirs in confident, and I may say defiant, response and accord: "Out of the sky as I came through!"

The interpretation of the creed by the Andover professors is not only reasonable—Pauline, Christian—it is wholly in the direction toward which the faces of the founders were turned. In rejecting the grosser, the more ignorant interpretation, they are but treading a little further the same path which the founders trod, and which has been trodden by every intelligent professor since, and by the whole Christian world so far as it has advanced in spiritual and intellectual life.

A single example will give ample illustration. The

creed declares that the wicked at their death will "with devils be plunged into the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone forever and ever."

The founders may well have taken this literally.

The founders of Andover were not disturbed by chemistry, geology, biology, ethnology, comparative philology. They "overset" the Greek into English and left it there. But do the most conservative of orthodoxy to-day believe that brimstone is eternal ; that oxygenation can be applied to soul ; that spirit can be subjected to the combustion of sulphur ? Do they believe that the immaterial soul is wedded to the chemical change of matter ? Mr. Samuel Jones lately and greatly scared a Boston congregation with a story of the Devil chasing a lost and departing soul around a woodpile and through a window—which is in line with a part of the Andover creed, but it is impossible to believe that the Andover complainants would join that hunting. Unless they would, unless they consider it possible to plunge a disembodied soul into actual burning brimstone, they have no ground for even a "friendly lawsuit" with the Andover professors. No member of an orthodox Congregational church who dissolves that brimstone in rhetoric can refuse to the Andover professors liberty to put a rhetorical cast or a literary interpretation upon any other word in the creed. One old departure from the literal rendering carries all new departures with it. There is no tribunal in the world which has authority to say, Thus far shalt thou go and no further in latitude of interpretation.

The professional agnostic affirms that barbarians inserted the text in the creed, that hypocrites teach it for money, and that it is simply a lie. This disposition of the matter has the merit of a simplicity so primitive as to be archaic. The moderate and reasonable layman and the "liberal" clergyman do not believe in the literal

brimstone, yet consider that the trust fund by which the seminary is supported demands literal brimstone, and, for the sake of perfect honesty and to set a much-needed good example, think it would be better to give up the bequest than to let the slightest suspicion of perversion of funds go out to the world on account of the quality of the brimstone.

These views are not more superficial than is to be expected from persons who are able to give only a swift glance to what needs a close inspection. It may be remarked that one principle of the moderate layman is fundamentally wrong. Avoidance of suspicion is not one of the large bases of action. If it were, the rule of a man's life would be changed from the certainty of his own conscience and consciousness to the shifting conjectures of another man's ignorance. It would make the ship sail for the wind and not for port. A ship heeds the wind, but does not follow it. A man heeds suspicion, but is not dominated by it. It may be his primal duty to disregard it. It is never his duty to do one wrong thing in order to avoid the suspicion of doing another.

Conservative orthodoxy under stress of science weakens a little and puts the brimstone into a rhetorical figure, but beyond that refuses to go. It gives way on one word, but utterly declines to permit any one to give way on another. It sees that science, chemistry, metaphysics, have made brimstone not only impossible, but ridiculous as a corner-stone of theology ; but *forever* is a term of another world, beyond the domain of science, incapable of proof or disproof, and on that it makes a stand.

Professor Park emphasizes the permanency of the Andover creed as a necessary condition of the original compromise by which it was adopted. But what did the founders mean by "permanency"? Their constitution declared in 1807 that the seminary should be forever con-

ducted and governed in conformity to certain principles, one of which was the Westminster Catechism. But anon the original founders learned that the Hopkinsians were about to establish another seminary in Newbury, and with a great deal more money, which money the Andoverians were exceedingly anxious to get hold of. The Hopkinsians were just as sturdily determined to keep hold of it themselves. Then began a struggle of the giants. Thirty-six times drove Eliphalet Pearsons over the hills of Andover and along the winding roads to Newbury after that money. Do I mean to insinuate that he was mercenary? Not in the least. I would have driven over with him the whole thirty-six times rather than he should not have got it—rather than have seen one starveling seminary pushing a feeble growth in Andover and another in Newbury.

The perseverance of the saints prevailed, but it prevailed by a compromise. There was to be a new creed. The catechism was to be mitigated and modified. Is that an adamantine permanency? Is that an emphatic forever?

Even this permanency did not endure. Between the years 1808 and 1826 the professors were required merely to declare their belief in the creed without reference to the catechism. Between 1826 and 1839 they were required to declare their belief in the creed, *with* reference to the catechism. In 1842 the associate professors were not required to declare their belief in anything more than the catechism. Their "forever," it will thus be seen, was of but a year's duration, and their "permanency" had a way of skipping like lambs. If their "forever" was so very fleeting, why must we make it eternal? What they did, we must assume they meant to do. What they did was to strike as nearly as possible an average on which all Christians could meet.

"The Andover statutes expressly forbid the retention in office of any professor who does not continue to approve himself 'a man of sound and orthodox principles of divinity, *agreeably to the system of evangelical doctrines contained in the Westminster Assembly's Shorter Catechism.*'" But Dr. Park said to Dr. Codman that he never believed, and never would believe, the doctrine taught in No. 82 of the Assembly's Catechism. How could they let in Professor Park ?

"We have always understood the visitors to hold," reply the authorities, "that any deviations from the exact letter of the creed which did not impair its evangelical character were permissible, and that it was because Professor Park's deviations were such that they were permitted. It is because later ones do not seem to be such that they are objected to."

It is thus seen that even the Professor Park orthodoxy does not demand strict adherence to the letter of the creed, but only to such letters of the creed as itself shall select. It permits departure from brimstone and No. 82—the things which Professor Park has been educated out of, but beyond Professor Park it is a breach of trust to pass.

The present Andover professors are only doing a little more of the same work which their predecessors wrought powerfully in their day. They not only permit the revelation of geology to illuminate the revelation of Sodom and Gomorrah, but they are studying it in the light of heredity and history. When the old orthodoxy explains that fire and brimstone mean that the soul of the incorrigibly wicked will be as exquisitely tortured as would be the body by fire, new orthodoxy sorrowfully admits it, but remembers that the sting of death is sin. The soul enslaved through all its life by sin, the soul that has persistently violated the law, disobeyed the order, destroyed the harmony of the universe, may, in the re-

vealing light of death, see itself so clearly, see the order of heaven so clearly, as to be devoured with shame and self-contempt—a shame and contempt more biting and burning than the matter-entangled spirit can conceive. The light from which it could hide behind the flesh it can not avoid when the flesh is laid off. Light which is the life of the healthy eye is agony to the diseased eye. But death itself is to be swallowed up in victory. Is it not possible, asks the larger hope—not seeing the way, seeing only perturbations of the divine harmony which seem to mean that there must be a way, because the *divine* harmony can not be perturbed—is it not possible that this spiritual shame shall presently destroy shameworthiness and work out spiritual purification ?

President Park emphasizes the difference in position of the respective antagonists by declaring that he only revolted against the "summarily expressed" doctrines of the catechism, whereas President Smyth flies out from the traces on those doctrines as "particularly expressed" in the creed. His statement is as convincing as William Lloyd Garrison's avowal of fatherly impartiality when he used to declare to his boys that he loved all his children alike—especially Fanny ! The great professor, balancing himself a-tiptoe on his slender adverb and calling aloud to orthodoxy and heterodoxy to behold

> "On what a narrow neck of land,
> 'Twixt two unbounded seas *I* stand !"

seems a very Blondin of acrobatic theology. But we, of the weak and wicked world—no Blondins—need a firmer foothold, and such foothold the founders furnish us. It is by no second thought, or strained construction, or late discovery, that the Andover professors hold their places. They are in the places appointed them by the founders themselves. They are there by a principle set in the solid base and actual substructure of the creed. That

creed opens with a declaration which not only justifies the professors in holding their places, but which imposes upon them the obligation to hold their places against all such efforts to destroy their incumbency; which constitutes it indeed a betrayal of trust, a dishonor to the founders to withdraw. This declaration embodies a principle which must last so long as time lasts, and can only be dismissed, if even then, by the wreck of matter and the crash of worlds.

By the terms of the creed, "Every professor shall, on the day of his inauguration, publicly make and subscribe a solemn declaration of his faith in divine revelation and in the fundamental and distinguishing doctrines of the Gospel as expressed in the following creed, which is supported by the infallible revelation which God constantly makes of himself in his works of creation, providence, and redemption."

This principle is broader and deeper than any item of the creed, because it underlies them all. It is the rule by which every one of them is to be tested. It is the foundation upon which they must all stand.

First is required—Faith in divine revelation.

Second—On this infallible revelation the creed stands. By this revelation the creed is supported. Therefore the creed is binding just so far as this revelation binds it, and no further. The reason of the creed is in its harmony with revelation. If in any point it diverges from revelation it becomes void, by the will and provision of the founders.

Third—This infallible revelation is not a completed thing, a fixed quantity. It is a revelation which God is "constantly" making. Therefore it is a progressive revelation. Therefore the creed must change to conform to the changing revelation. There is no meaning to the word *constantly*, unless it means this. Language

is incapable of being used in evidence, unless *constantly* is a word of process. To say that God is constantly making a revelation of himself, and yet that our knowledge of him must never increase and our belief regarding him must never change, is only absurdity. The founders gave the creed, which, in their view, formulated the revelation that had been made up to their time; but they required the professors to swear that they would explain the Scriptures to their pupils with integrity and faithfulness "*according to the best light God shall give me.*"

And in full view of this lucid oath, pledging the teachers forever to an extraordinary generous seeking and diffusing of light, Judge Hoar stands up before the Supreme Court of Massachusetts and likens the Andover Seminary to a blind asylum whose provisions require that its teachers should be always blind! The founders may admit, he says, that light is a blessing, but their statutes forbid the professors to give it to their pupils!

The learned, brilliant, and fascinating judge is so captivated by the humorous possibilities of the situation that he neglects the serious side. To him the sturdy resistance of the professors seems like the prolonged struggle of a cat against her captors. His feline figure suggests other felicities, for he brings to the question only the antics of a frolicsome kitten over a ball of twine. He is charmed by the roll and the snarl, butt and rebutter, and he curvets into a thousand graceful and amusing attitudes; but on the real and abiding issues involved he has not taken the trouble to give himself or the Supreme Court any more enlightenment than the kitten has on spherical geometry or the angles of incidence and reflection.

In imposing revelation as the basis of the creed, and in stipulating a recognition that God is "constantly" making this revelation, the founders, by inevitable implica-

tion, not only warrant, but impose, constant change in the creed in order to conform to every fresh revelation. This is no new doctrine. This is no new departure. Augustine says the same thing: When they say a thing is not rightly done if it be changed, truth, on the contrary, protests that it is not rightly done *if it be not changed*; because, in both cases, it will be rightly done if the difference be regulated according to the difference in the circumstances.

Schopenhauer alludes to the same inevitable inherent advance of truth when he says "she enjoys but a short time of trial between two long eras—in the first of which she is condemned as paradoxical; in the last, despised as trivial." In the Bible story we have seen that the notion of blood atonement was so deeply rooted in the human mind that ages upon ages could not dig it out. The truth that there could be any remission of sins without blood was condemned by the world as impossible. Finally came Christ himself, the well-beloved Son of God—Emmanuel, God with us—preaching the doctrine of *repentance* for the remission of sins—at-one-ment without blood, reconciliation to God by reformation; and that doctrine has so supplanted the doctrine of blood atonement that repentance atonement seems a commonplace. Christ came into the world just to teach repentance for remission of sin, we say—that is absurd! He did not come for such a little thing as that. As Schopenhauer says, the great truth is despised as trivial. And we go to work and invent some clumsy and impossible mechanical and mercantile contract between the Father and the Son to make Christ's mission seem worth while.

The Andover founders specified the sources whence revelation might be expected, so that there can be no mistake; and these sources they place on a level in point of authority.

Works of Creation : This includes every possible discovery of truth by study of the material universe till time shall be no more. Whatever light shall be thrown upon earth or stars from geology, biology, astronomy, chemistry, the founders welcome. Whatever illustrates the real mode of creation, the properties of matter, they accept. For all the discoveries and utilities of steam, electricity, the story of the rocks and the suns, the suggestions of the skeleton and the embryo, they made room, only asking that it be a revelation of God—that is, truth. No Darwin, or Huxley, or Tyndall, past, present, or future, can ever climb outside the scope of those Andover founders, whom we in our shallow arrogance have called "iron-bound," but whose principle, inspired of the Holy Spirit, is as flexile as life itself. It may well be that they did not know—though it may well be that they did divine—the full scope of their words, but ever the promised reward of them who speak and do the best they know, is that they shall follow on to know the Lord.

Revelation in Providence : This includes the whole history of humanity—language, race, growth, migration, the rise and fall of nations, and of men, from the first rude trace of primeval man upon the earth to the last item in the morning newspaper. The present is photographing itself to the student with a minuteness never excelled. Into the past, scientist, antiquarian, Egyptologist, are searching with an enthusiasm constantly increasing under success, and a success ever conquering fresh advantages. But whatever revelation God has made or may make of himself in his relations to men—through flint knife, or exhumed statue, or uncovered tile, or deciphered record, or discovered manuscript, or long-buried city—the founders of Andover Seminary made provision for it all in the opening sentence, the ground plan of their creed.

Revelation of Redemption brings us to the culmination

of all revelation—in Jesus Christ our Lord—the Holy Spirit of prophecy; the immanent Deity—God with us—Emmanuel. The written word remains. No addition can be made to the scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. Therefore the revelation which God is constantly making of himself in redemption must be through new light thrown on the Bible, new light shining upon its interpretation from the new revelation of himself through his works of creation and providence, through science and history. For this also the founders made room in that profound and wonderful opening sentence of their "iron-bound" creed—a sentence which binds them, and binds us, not with iron, but with the elasticity and strength of the interstellar ether to every sphere of truth that shall swing out into the light of new knowledge henceforth for evermore.

For the Andover professors to give up their seminary would be to give up the inspiration of the fathers to the limitations of the sons; would be to relinquish light to darkness, breadth to narrowness, Heaven's flash of radiance to earth's brooding obscurity. It would be to snatch from the founders the glory of their crown, to hide its splendor beneath the *débris* of our own mechanisms. The obstructionists may succeed, but it will be temporarily. The Supreme Court of Massachusetts may turn their faces from the light, but the court of last resort is not even in Massachusetts. If this age can not discern Heaven's shining, the next age will. It is better to fail in a good cause than to succeed in a bad one. But final failure is not. Already, beautiful upon the mountains, may be seen the feet of Him that bringeth good tidings. All the air is alive and astir with the breath and blossom of spring.

## CHAPTER IX.

### THE SECTARIAN ARGUMENT.

*Around a family table, where debate is always in order, if sometimes in disorder—the disorder of perfect freedom—the Sunday luncheon was once diversified by a lively discussion of the sermon that had just been preached in the home pulpit by a rather distinguished stranger. From this especial sermon the talk wandered on to the nature, object, and origin of the sermon in general and its place in the Church, and thence to the Church and its mission.*

*An hour afterward a young man who had been one of the most interested disputants put into the hands of another and an equally interested disputant a paper containing his "addenda" to the discussion. This paper, which I have called "An Argument for Episcopacy," now printed for the first time, and the following paper, "An Argument for Congregationalism," pertinent to the same occasion, were written without knowledge each of the other's writing. The second paper was subsequently prepared for publication. The first paper I have not had the courage or the desire to alter, even so far as to change the conversational and familiar tone belonging to its private purpose. It was but incidentally preserved, and, coming to light now, is presented to the Bible Class—all of whom were the writer's friends—as a personal and pertinent incident, which they will be glad to learn; an unexpected voice, which the class will*

> "*Hold, not as wise, or no, or out of place, but dear,*
> *Because the lips are no more here.*"

*The young man was not by profession a churchman. From a child he had known the Holy Scriptures, had devoutly accepted their doctrines, and had faithfully followed their precepts in a life of love. As son, brother, friend, he was not only irreproachable, but altogether delightful. In every intellectual aspect his early promise was al-*

*ready rich in performance. To weakness, to suffering of every sort, he gave quick, enduring sympathy, prompt and efficient succor. Brilliant, manly, chivalrous, elegant, sought at club and banquet and every form of social festivity and mental contest, discreet and able in business, with great aptitude for great affairs, yet wise and patient in the smallest details, home was the field of his richest and dearest life.*

*When the Bible Class began to be talked of, he promptly and gayly announced, "I shall attend!"*

*Before the Bible Class could meet he had vanished from our bewildered vision; he had entered upon the activities of the spiritual world.*

*To him, gentleman of the old school, knight of the new time;*

*To him whose name will not any more be spoken among living men, a living name;*

*To him who gathered into his short life the love of many a lifetime;*

*To*

*WALKER BLAINE,*

*I consecrate his own.*

### *REASONS FOR EPISCOPACY.*

I WISH to set myself right in an argument which I advanced, and I prefer to put it in writing. What I meant to say is this:

What the English call dissenting churches, sacrifice service to preaching. This is a wrongful view of religious worship, if not of religion itself, and will lead, if it has not already led, to harm. Your position is that if a congregation wish preaching, let them have it; after all, it is a mere form and can make little difference. It is not an essential thing—part of the being, existence, life itself of religion. I do not think it is, and I suppose all people who are religious, no matter what their sect—all people, even, who may be disbelievers, provided they are good and inclined to good things (which, after all, leaves out chiefly the criminal classes)—are agreed as to

the duty of man; unite in believing that conduct is the greater part of life; that to work toward righteousness, to lead pure and upright lives by rules clearly recognized, known to the Christian religion and easily ascertained by every one and any one, is the way rightly to attain the three fourths of life which constitutes conduct. Herbert Spencer, working without aid of Scripture, studying solely the development of man morally and mentally; Matthew Arnold, critically examining the writings of the Old and New Testaments—traveling by different roads, will find the same end to their journey. This, it seems to me, is perhaps the strongest proof of the truth of Christianity: that it laid down moral laws and essayed an explanation of the true inwardness of life, which is satisfactory and satisfying to the highest form of modern critical thought, to material as well as to psychical philosophy. That is why a gross wrong must be done, and is done, when a man in the pulpit tries to prove the truth of St. John's gospel by so barren and unsatisfactory an exegesis as we heard this morning. But this is not what I desire to discuss.

That the Congregationalist and Presbyterian and other churches, which have no established form of worship or formulated prayer, do attach great, the chief, importance to the sermon, it is unnecessary to demonstrate. I assume this, but it is abundantly shown by the way in which churches ordinarily conduct their "settlement" of a minister. The various candidates appear and preach, the call is extended, and the minister settled chiefly by reason of the sermon; as a rule, churches do not even hear persons whose religious views on essential points are not in harmony with the professed views of the denomination. Possibly the Methodists differ, for there a minister is, I think, assigned by the bishop, or conference, or somebody, for a definite term of years; but in modern

practice I am told that if a congregation desires the minister to remain, and the minister desires to stay with the congregation, the conference ordinarily conforms to their united wish.

A stronger argument may be made against my views by the assertion that the very same practice of ordination prevails in the Episcopal church. Possibly it does. I do not know, but I assume that it does. The difference is here. Your Congregationalist church in all outward matters depends for the beauty and satisfying nature of its service upon the minister. This so far as adults even are concerned. If a Canon Farrar brings learning, eloquence, and simplicity to Hamilton or to Augusta, undoubtedly his gracious prayers and earnest and eloquent sermons will do great good, especially the sermons, just as they now do great good in his own church; but if a man is settled in Augusta or in Hamilton whose faultiness of logic and want of mental tact are apparent to a large part of his auditors, his sermon and the whole service will at least do no good to them. On the other hand, in the Episcopal church, his capacity for doing harm, to say the least, is lessened. To use Arnold's mathematics, three fourths of the service in that church is contained in the prayer-book and lessons—one fourth in the discourse. The converse proportion seems to me true in the other churches.

To set forth certain reasons why I believe that more attention to service, less to sermon, is better: People prefer the sermon; why? Because of wrong thinking; because originally dissent arose on matters of doctrine, and they desired an exposition of doctrines which they had come to regard as very precious. Scott's David Deans occurs to me, and the type of the Scotch covenanters, running through his books. Next, they came to regard the sermon as exceedingly important, because they were

taught by their fathers to regard it thus; and then the minister also began to be regarded as something very sacred. The early Scotch covenanters just mentioned did not invest the expositor of their doctrine with a sacred character. He was the mouth-piece for the doctrine dear to them, employed as a pleader, an advocate, because polemically learned, just as a lawyer is employed to mend a title or defend a suit; I imagine they regarded him as little more. But the position of the minister in a Protestant dissenting congregation became something far higher. It would be a subject of curious study to examine historically the growth of the New England clergy to power and to reverence; to a position in the view of their congregation far greater than rector or curate, though he is set apart and consecrated by those on whom apostolic succession has fallen; to a position as great and as influential as the priest of the Romish church.

For the reasons why I think men are wrong in making the sermon—not service—essential, let me say, first, the great need of the Church is to influence the young to right living. If the Church can teach the youth to conduct themselves rightly, to think honestly and justly, can make them good men and women, it has accomplished a great deal. All that Christ required of the young ruler was to obey the ten commandments, and it was only upon the youth's earnest protestation that he had done so from infancy, and that this did not satisfy him, that he was told to sell all that he had. It may be well for the Church to have an ideal of utter self-abnegation, but it will only reach it by the practical method of teaching its followers to obey the decalogue. Personally I have been at church five hundred times, to guess roughly. I began going young and I continued—at school and college compulsorily, and now rather carelessly. How many of the ser-

mons which I have heard or which were preached at me do I remember? The ablest men in the Congregationalist denomination thundered twice every Sunday from thirty minutes to an hour, each at a crowd of two or three hundred school-boys. How much did any of those boys remember? I have heard five hundred long prayers, as the boys at school called them. How much do I remember of them? How much did I understand? Only enough to be sure that never once have I heard a prayer as beautiful as that of the prayer-book of the Episcopal church; only enough to know that not one prayer put forth what I rationally might desire as well as does that beautiful service. Do you think that a child or boy could have gone to hear the service of the Church of England as many as five hundred times and not have borne in mind forever prayer and litany, the ten commandments, the two which "our Lord Jesus Christ saith," which Dean Stanley so rightly commends the American church for reading each Sunday after the other ten? The strongest associations which I have personally are connected with certain old hymns—not the words, perhaps, but the tunes, "In the cross of Christ I glory," for instance. Fairly stating the case, then, which is all I wish to do, is not this true? The strangely barren, hebdomadally varying character of the service of the Protestant church leaves little or no impression on the mind of the youth; that of a settled form where worship is made predominant does. The sermons they share in common.

Is not the advantage of impression and association and remembrance in after life with the church which magnifies service, accentuates worship, at the expense of homily or sermon?

How is it with a church for older people? I take the broad ground that the necessity of a church, the work

which a church is called upon to do, is to strengthen men in habits of right living, in worshiping God and keeping his commandments; and that this is best done by impressing these lessons. If the simile of "Except ye become as a little child" means anything to me when I reason about it, it means that I must be as free from prejudice or taint or misconception or misconstruction as a little child; as free from error and as ready to learn. If you can not teach a child the truths of religion and the Bible, the comparison is worthless. So that, after all, the essential truths of Christianity may be learned in infancy; and can not be better learned, but possibly may be better understood, in maturity. The work of the Church, as the work of the school, must be done among those of tender years. Reasoning from personal experience (in this instance a fair method), a church with a beautiful free worship which impresses itself on childhood has the greater chance for good. The seed may fall on stony places; but more seed falls. I do not argue in favor of absolute fixed forms. Language may change, and if the prayer for deliverance from sudden death has acquired a new and wrong meaning, write "violent death." I do not argue against extemporaneous prayer, though personally it seems to me that the prayer-book is comprehensive enough for all petitioners. But I do vote earnestly in favor of a church which emphasizes the worship of God, and which gives to worship, in the sense of prayer and thanksgiving, the chief place.

*AN ARGUMENT FOR CONGREGATIONALISM.*

While we were discussing in the Bible Class the doctrines and the dissensions of Presbyterians and Congregationalists, I thought I discerned a light in some faces as of triumph. Indeed, distinctly in my hearing, if not directly addressed to my hearing, came the exultant subtones: "There is nothing for it but to join the Episcopal church and find rest."

Perhaps no better reply can be given than the one that was given on the spot by a steadfast Presbyterian of the highest rank in the world: "You have just as questionable doctrines as we, only you let them alone!" Certainly, no doctrine of any sect can be more difficult to prove than this, for instance, which was established as an article of religion by the bishops, the clergy, and the laity of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, in the year of our Lord 1801, and is bound up in the Book of Common Prayer to-day:

Christ did truly rise again from death and took again his body, with flesh, bones, and all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature; wherewith he ascended into heaven, and there sitteth until he return to judge all men at the last day.

But to the glory of the Episcopal church let it be remembered that she also is a church militant. Her Thirty-nine Articles bristle with her flags of ancient war. Within the memory of men not yet old, her right and left grappled in the fierce contest of utter sincerity, and, Heaven be praised! the right prevailed. Men who were then, so to speak, on trial for life, occupy now posts of honor on the walls of her Zion. It is not necessary to join the Episcopal church to secure peace; but it is edifying to observe how, in the past, the Episcopal church has conquered a peace.

At present, however, let us observe, in the interests of inter-church comity and of general intelligence, that the questions between these churches are chiefly of polity and not of doctrine. The Congregationalist by conviction is a Congregationalist, because Congregationalism, considered as a policy, not as a creed, seems to combine in the happiest proportions individual religious freedom with social religious organization.

Congregationalism is sometimes said to be that form of ecclesiastical government which is most nearly allied to, and which most closely harmonizes with, the Republicanism that constitutes our national political government.

This, however, is hardly demonstrable. Congregationalism is modeled upon the Southern idea of a confederacy, rather than upon the Northern idea of a nation. In Congregationalism all power inheres in the congregation. Each church is a separate and independent body, conducting its own business without reference to any higher body, without ultimate appeal beyond itself; calling councils, but only for decorum; combining with other churches in a conference, but only for conference; organizing itself with others in a national council, but only for counsel. In none of these bodies does a church relinquish a particle of its self-government to any other body, either in respect of belief or action. The conference may, for difference of creed, withdraw fellowship from some church. The council may, for lack of confidence, refuse to assist at the installation of some minister. But none the less does the particular church remain a Congregational church, organized and perfect in all its parts; and none the less may a church insist on installing and retaining the pastor of its choice without forfeiting its claims to be a Congregational church. All that it forfeits is its place in the association of Congregational churches. So far as they are concerned it is independent, but so far as

its own constitution is concerned it is Congregational. A church may at any moment secede from any conference, withdraw its representation in national council, refuse to act in accordance with the advice of a local council—and no council, local or national, is empowered or pretends to do more than advise—and the worst and most that can happen is that it may cease to be a member of a local association and become an independent church. It in no way loses its entity as a Congregational church. All its organization is still complete within itself. Incorporation into any larger body is purely voluntary, does not affect the constitution of the larger body, is a relation which can be assumed and resigned at will. The departure of any church does not organically rend the body from which it seceded. The advent of any church in no way constitutes the larger body an organism. A conference or a council is but a voluntary assembly of churches, a congregation of congregations present by representatives. A church is but a voluntary assembly of believers united by their belief. There is thus no Congregational church, while there are a great many Congregational churches. In this, therefore, it is unlike our national government, that it is, in any combination, but a collection of organisms of equal rank. These are never, like the States of the Union, welded into one, a different and a higher body, the nation. The Congregationalist is strictly and simply a home ruler.

Mr. Gladstone speaks of the church, of the priesthood or ministry, of the sacraments, as the established machinery of Christian training, as the wings of the soul; but sometimes the machinery becomes too heavy for the motor. The church and the priesthood and the sacraments shut the soul away from God rather than interpret God to the soul. The wings are wooden and crush the spirit down when it would soar toward its source.

Christ established no church, neither Catholic nor Congregational, nor any church between the two. All ecclesiasticism is of human origin. Christ left undisturbed all the mechanism of human society—ecclesiastical, political, domestic, friendly. More than that, he repeatedly and publicly called attention to the fact. He protested that he did not come to destroy the law or the prophets. He preached in the synagogues already built; he entered with ready sympathy into the social festivities to which he was invited; he loyally paid tribute to the rulers under whom he found himself; but he enunciated principles under whose working the law became only a shadow and a reminiscence—synagogues crumbled, tyrants fell, festivals were purified.

Neither one church nor another, therefore, can be justified in claiming to be the original Church of Christ. Congregationalism finds its warrant—a true warrant—in the promise of Christ: Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them. That is what a church establishment is for—to retain the spirit of Christ on the earth, to diffuse the spirit of Christ through the earth, to draw the kingdoms of this world into the one kingdom of our Lord, the Kingdom of Heaven.

We have the assurance of Christ that no complicated machinery is necessary, no Synod or Presbytery or Hierarchy, Episcopate or Bishopric, or See or sermon. A church is the simplest possible form of organization. It is only to be on the spot. It is only to come together in the name of Christ, and Christ will be there. Every little country school-house prayer-meeting, every pioneer group gathering itself in a log hut on the outskirts of civilization, can make itself into a church complete in all its parts, because the only condition is that it shall assemble in the name of Christ—not in the name of rivalry or

faction, ambition to establish its own sect, or dissatisfaction with the other minister, or determination to have its own way—but in the name of Christ. This is the condition which men must fulfill. Christ has promised to fulfill the other condition. He will be present.

The name of Christ—name which is above every name; name in which lies all our hope, perfection of the life that now is, promise of the life that is to come—how many crimes are committed, how much of selfishness, self-will, vulgarity, and vice broods under that holy name! But there is none other name given under Heaven among men whereby we can be saved, and upon this rock must the true Church be built.

Congregationalism acknowledges the invisible Christ as the only church foundation, and builds upon this foundation no visible church universal after the fashion of the kingdoms of this world, but recognizes that the true church universal must be invisible and spiritual, after the fashion of the Kingdom of Heaven.

Any warrant for Congregationalism in the words of Christ is not to be confounded with an imposition of Congregationalism upon the world as the one imperative divinely ordained church government. The context itself shows that Christ did not in the text command or found the establishment of a church, for he recognized a church already existing. Before giving his disciples the assurance of his presence at their gatherings, he had directed them in a certain contingency to tell their troubles to the Church. Therefore, a church must have been already formed. What this church was, or on what principles organized, we are not told. Probably it was in conformity with Christ's subsequent assurance, which assurance itself may have been but the stronger affirmation of some previous unrecorded "seed-thought," for the word used and translated *church* is defined to mean literally *congre-*

*gation, any public assembly.* It may mean, and has sometimes been supposed to mean, the Jewish Sanhedrim on the one hand, or any assembly of devout men on the other.

This declaration of Christ—that where two or three are gathered together in the name of Christ, there will Christ be in the midst—is no more a divine ordering of Congregationalism as the one enjoined Scriptural, ecclesiastical polity, than is that other declaration—*Think not that I am come to destroy the law and the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill*—an enforcement of the perpetuity, the universal binding obligation of the law of Moses. It is no more a divine ordering of Congregationalism than is that other declaration to Peter, *Upon this rock will I build my church*, a divine ordering of the Roman Catholic church as the one only true church. All such interpretations seem equally and utterly foreign to the true interpretation of Christ's life and teachings. We do not need to fall back upon the researches of learning, though they show us earlier manuscripts in which the text "upon this rock will I build my church" is not found. Granting the full text, the Roman Catholic inference is only a little harder to draw than the Congregational inference. Both are forced. Neither follows of its own accord.

We greatly weaken our cause when we found it on any adventitious circumstance, on any isolated text, and not on natural, eternal principles. We who worship God with simple rites are too apt to sneer at ceremonials more minute and numerous than our own; but all ceremonial is of human origin, of man's device. The posturings and vestments of the Episcopal church, the altar and incense of the Roman Catholic church, we sometimes picture as un-Christlike—pompous, worldly, not to say wicked additions to the simplicity, corruptions of the purity, of the

true Church of Christ. But they are not necessarily wicked or wanton. True, Christ ordained no miter or chasuble, cope or cassock, but neither did he ordain the chorister, or the cushioned pews, or the silver communion tankards of the Congregational churches. I suppose the embroidered robes of the archbishop are more like the parted garments and the allotted vesture of Calvary than is the *de rigueur* black coat of the Congregational minister. These things are absolutely human, matters of taste, choice, discretion, adding an acquired sacredness of years to what was originally in some cases but commonplace every-day custom, and in others the hallowed relic of an outworn and discarded faith. They are important only in what they are not. They are merely interesting in what they are. It is suggestive, it is even thrilling, to reflect that in looking upon what are sometimes uncivilly called the mummeries of Roman Catholic worship we are beholding the last faint and fading traces of the worship of vanished peoples. If early Christians gathered into Christianity pagan rites which they could not wholly suppress, if they strove steadfastly to empty these rites of the old errors and fill and transfuse them with the new truths, who can say that they were not wise, as well as pious, in so doing? Was it not the way of Moses? Was it not the way of the apostles, nay, of their master also? If those new truths are in time devitalized into new errors, is it not the way of the world? If, on the other hand, these ancient rites are quick with somewhat that answers to human need, an aid to devotion and reverence; if some souls are subdued to receptiveness, quiescence, submission by the solemn ceremonial of the Roman Catholic and the Episcopal churches, so that the bread of life is more readily assimilated thereby, pure and devout Congregationalism has with this no quarrel. Congregationalism denies only

that these are divinely ordained to the divine exclusion of its own simpler rites and common garb.

Thus, also, Congregationalism recognizes the validity of immersion as a sign of adhesion to the person and teachings of Christ, while it rejects wholly the idea that immersion was ordained by Christ, that the sprinkling of water upon the forehead in the name of Christ is not an equally valid sign, or that any application of water is more than the mere outward token of inward and spiritual grace, accepted by Christ, and, therefore, out of love to him, adopted by his Church, but not enjoined by him as an indispensable duty or an incomprehensible mystery. The Congregationalist no more believes that it is necessary to be plunged into a tank in order to be buried with Christ in baptism than he believes a cup of wine to be the blood of Christ because he said at the last supper: This is my blood. He believes both constructions of Scripture to be forced; obstructions to truth and not truth itself.

Congregationalism, as I understand it, is founded on the nature of man as trained according to Scripture, and marching in ecclesiasticism *pari passu* with its march in science, in politics, and in the common arts of life. Congregationalism, in the time of Christ, and in our own, is in some sense a reaction against a too elaborate and tyrannical organization, a return to nature after the fatigues of cumbrous form. The Hebraism of Christ's time was an intricacy of generations, and bound upon the shoulders of men burdens too heavy to be borne. Christ, not with violence, but with gentle insinuation of truth, unloosed those heavy burdens and let the oppressed go free. When a Jewish preacher was to be installed with whatever detail of their separating ritual and sacerdotal consecration, one of the charges to the pastor was: "Take thou liberty to teach what is BOUND and what is LOOSE." Christ formu-

lated no argument against this as a usurpation of divine power, heaped upon it no denunciation, but to the little listening group of unlettered fishermen, learning of him to be meek and lowly in heart, he said quietly: "Whatsoever *ye* bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever *ye* loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." It was the indirect but complete annihilation of all the arrogant pretensions of the Jewish Church—priest and rabbi. It was the unfrocking of the Jewish clergy. They had become an absolute hierarchy. They claimed authority over the Kingdom of Heaven, power to lay down its law, to open and to close its doors. All this Jesus swept away with the gentlest breath of his lips. In the Kingdom of Heaven the greatest is not he who claims the most; but the greatest is as a little child. You, little ones, he seems to say to his disciples, you ignorant but knowing me, you are the real priesthood of my spiritual kingdom. You, without synagogue, or ritual, or birthright of Levi, but taught of me, you are the ones who have the secret of the Kingdom of Heaven. The Catholic church, founding on this its claim to pronounce absolution, adopts the exact idea which Christ indirectly condemned; builds up its close-fitting and far-reaching organization on the very plan of the rejected Jewish priesthood. Christ denied to any hierarchy the control of the Kingdom of Heaven, making it the vested right of Peter and of the disciples, uneducated fishermen, unconsecrated by form; the vested right of any two or three who should be gathered together in his name; the vested right of any congregation of believers, or, indeed, of any single believer, praying to the Father in Heaven.

Congregationalism thus interposes the least possible machinery between man and his Maker. The constant tendency of mankind is to sacrifice unto the net and burn incense to the drag—and a very good reason the

prophet gives—because by them is their portion fat and their meat plenteous. If, in addition to this, the net and drag are made æsthetic, sonorous, magnificent with all the splendor of wealth and culture, music, art, and architecture, the danger of remembering the net alone and forgetting him who giveth all is greatly increased. It is the aim of Congregationalism to use only such and so much netting as may be necessary to catch men; so much form and ceremony as may be necessary to the preservation of values, to the dissemination of truth; as much as is hinted at in the words and deeds of Christ; as much as is demanded in the Pauline requirement that all things be done decently and in order. Congregationalism would have no organization for organization's sake, but only so much as shall best secure the preaching and practicing of the gospel. It sees in all Christ's teachings a steadfast tendency against the machinery of the Jewish church, a steadfast endeavor to place religion upon a spiritual and practical basis. Humanity is constantly asking: Shall we worship the Father in this mountain or in Jerusalem; by the Greek, or the Roman, or the English, or the Presbyterian church, with priest or minister, with a white neck-tie or a white surplice? And Christ ever replies: Neither here nor there, neither in one church nor another, neither with robes nor bells, nor pulpit nor order. All this is not Christianity. It is only custom, convenience—temporary, incidental, and altogether changeable. Real worship is in spirit and in truth. If the elaborate ecclesiasticisms of the world claim that they are necessary to keep alive in men the sense of divinity; that the world needs, still, machinery even if it tends to superstition; that promulgation of the gospel must be by intricate politics, checks and definitions, ranks and orders, changing robes and sounding services—wheels within wheels of command and subordination—why still has

Congregationalism other work to do than dispute with them. I think they are mistaken. I think a good deal of their effectiveness is in danger of becoming sacrifice unto the net and burnt-incense to the drag. I think it is sometimes worshiping and serving organization more than God. I think that, as a direct result, the church which is the furthest removed from Congregationalism, which is, perhaps, the most powerful, compact, complete organization on the earth, reveals a tendency to sacrifice principle to power; not simply by the fact that its children commit sin against its teachings as Congregational sinners do against the teachings of their creeds, but that it throws so ample a shelter of ecclesiasticism over individual responsibility that it sometimes lulls the conscience to stupor, where it should, instead, sting to renewing vigilance and vigor. As a result, side by side, hand in hand with its Christian doctrines, its saintly lives, its heavenly charities, go—not as in other churches, dishonored and dragged, a body of death, but unnoted, practices which a freer inward development under a less rigid external imposition might reveal in their true light, might detach and destroy. As a political force, as an ecclesiastical principality, as a kingdom of earth, that church might thus become less powerful, but by the Christ standard it would be greater in the Kingdom of Heaven.

In all time-movements we must recognize the divine hand, and Congregationalists bid God-speed to those who follow the Master, even though they follow not us, even though they sometimes double and turn upon us; but much of enginery seems not only to belong to and to build up a kingdom of earth, rather than the Kingdom of Heaven, it seems also to have a tendency to conceal the real nature of the Kingdom of Heaven. Christ, leaving the earth as a person, to remain forever upon it as a presence, as the Holy Spirit, emphasized but one mode of evan-

gelization: "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations."

Whenever an idea is sent fresh into the world, the tendency is for it to stiffen at once into forms. The foot-fall of Christ had hardly ceased upon the hills of Judea before his spiritual church was loading itself down with prescripts. Reason is constantly breaking forth into revolution against prescription, and is no sooner free than another system of prescription is constructed. It is the mission of Congregationalism constantly to antagonize this constant tendency—not to malign or traduce it, but to moderate it to the lowest advantageous point. It is the mission of Congregationalism to keep as close as possible to the Christ-idea. When the rest of the world is swinging its censer and broidering its garments in the name of Christ, it is the part of Congregationalism to remind the world, by example, indeed, rather than by precept, that this is not Christianity. It may accompany worship, but worship is other than this.

Congregationalism can make no greater mistake than to erect its simple and sensible forms into as rigid a framework as that which incases, and sometimes imprisons, other churches. As formalists, Congregationalists are weak. There is no comparison between our severe services and the sonorous, spectacular, and impressive ritual of what are called the historic churches. Our strength lies only in keeping close to the spirit and teachings of Christ. Art and science and culture have done their utmost to produce the solemn forms of a thousand years' growth. We can have no hope of improving on that. These churches are historic because they have cultivated those qualities of human nature, love of beauty, music, sentiment, which answer most easily to cultivation. Our church has been relatively inconspicuous in history because its chief appeal is to the reason, upon which indolent

human nature is loath to rely, from whose cultivation it largely shrinks. Christ makes a man judge for himself. Man greatly prefers to put upon some one else the responsibility of judging for him. The history of Congregationalism is a history of new departures. It began fresh, pure, strong with the inspiring words of Christ. It has begun afresh many times since under the bold and lofty impulse of clear thought and holy aspiration. It is continually hardening into limits, fixity, death, but it rises again with newness of life, and each time a little higher, with a little more life than before. It will prevail only with the prevalence of reason. Believing that mankind is on the road from tutelage to self-government, from the dominion of the animal to the dominion of reason, and that man can best learn to use his reason by using it, the Congregationalist takes courage.

It will readily be seen, as it naturally follows, that while other churches may, in seasons of torpor, fall back upon the embodied truth of their forms, Congregationalism, which has no embodied truth, must have its truth always fluent to be vital. The historic churches may afford to sleep, strong and confident, behind their barrier of sentiment, their record of power, their store of litany and liturgy and ritual, feeling that the wheels are still turning while they slumber. But Congregationalism has no such barrier against the steady tide of advancing thought; has no such substitute for the steady working of the ransomed and regenerated reason. Unless one is free-minded, active, receptive, with the windows of his soul—be they large or small—wide open to the rays of the ever-rising sun of righteousness, a Congregational church is no place for him. Nothing is more unattractive, I might almost say more repulsive, than the meager formulas of Congregational worship in the hands of a pastor without thought. If one's mind has touched its limits, if he is settled im-

movably on any creed whatever, if he pins his faith to Scott, or Edwards, or Calvin, or Athanasius—to any other than the one only name given under heaven among men whereby we can be saved—Congregationalism is not for him. Let him go into the historic churches, and sleep on there, and take his rest. In a Congregational church he is losing all the good of their beautiful and imposing ritual, of the obedience and decorum which they command. He is missing all the good of the free mental play, the untrammeled spiritual growth, the incessant search for truth, the development of the whole man which constitutes the sole "reason to be" of Congregationalism.

Congregationalism is valuable only as it keeps the human reason in close, sensitive, loving contact with the divine reason. In constructing houses of refuge for the repose of reason, it is the weakest of all earth's architects, building but booths, always slight, sometimes uncouth, which every wind of heaven may rock and rend.

Nor is this a discourteous reflection upon other churches. That would be as foolish as un-Christian and false. Great men have been nurtured in them all, but is not greatness always Congregational? Great men rise above all denominational limits and appeal to the great congregation, to the universal reason. The great man is, I think, never great as a churchman. He is great outside and above his church. Nay, he is even often at odds with his church. Its bonds hang loosely on him, and they who are held together only by bonds fear his bold, free flight. His constituency ceases to be denominational, ceases to be ecclesiastical, becomes the congregation of believers throughout the world, whether Jew, or Romanist, or Calvinist, or Scientist—men who keep bright the lamp of thought, feeding its perpetual flame from that central light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world.

## CHAPTER X.

### INSPIRATION.

PRACTICALLY, the religious light which all except scholars receive from study is light thrown from the pulpit. The pulpit is the popular chair of theology in the university of the world. Thence we are taught what is the revelation of God. Therefore, if the pulpit is wrong, the error is wide-spread.

And the pulpit is sometimes wrong! So wrong that we can see it. The pulpit is often so forcible and impressive in the presentation of error that this presentation furnishes the best frame for truth. A clergyman may state so concisely what you ought to believe, that for the first time you perceive at a glance exactly why you do not believe it—which is the next best thing to believing it.

Eighteen centuries bear witness to the thoroughness of Gamaliel's learning, to the excellence of his character, to the culture of his spirit, to the eminence of his reputation. He was a powerful leader of the people and a teacher so impressive that his most celebrated pupil, a man whose name and fame brighten with the rolling years, characterizes his instruction as in "the perfect manner."

Yet his teaching was wrong—so wrong that this very pupil, his brilliant eulogist, counted himself the chief of sinners for carrying his teacher's instructions into practice! Is it not possible that our own teachers, learned

doctors of the divine law, eloquent in council, had in reputation among all the people, teaching according to the perfect manner of the law of the Fathers, zealous toward God, may yet sometimes be teaching doctrines as antagonistic to the truth as were those of Gamaliel, which led Paul to persecute men and women unto the death?

The existence of God and his revelation of himself to man is the most important, the most practical, the most vital of all religious, perhaps of all earthly questions. On this point of all points we not only welcome but crave light. Dr. Clark expounds the nature of the revelation of God to man under the figure of a man who began life by floundering in the mire, wading in a swamp of mystery, ignorance, and sin. The more he struggled the more he mired. Presently he felt something solid beneath his feet. It was God's promise. He stood on this and was safe—until the rationalistic craze seized him. Then he began to widen his foundations, driving in for one pile "reason," for another "ethical consciousness," for another "the moral fitness of things," and for another "God mirrored and limited in human conception." Then the structure of Christian faith was carefully moved aside from its old rock base and made to rest partly on a divine and partly on a human foundation.

This is negatively an admirable, and even, in most respects, an exact, statement of the true doctrine of inspiration; the word of God resting on, certified by, appealing to man's reason, to his ethical consciousness, to the moral fitness of things—God mirrored but limited in human conception.

But Dr. Clark names it only to reject it. After a while his poor man found, to his horror, that the pile work was not firm; that his vast outlay was hopelessly sunk. He abandoned his whole scheme, and found no solidity or rest until he rebuilt "his faith upon a child-

like trust in every word of God. His final, fixed belief was, 'Forever, O Lord, thy word is settled in heaven.'"

These be pious words. Would it be flippant, irreligious to say that they only tickle the ear and never touch the brain? He who regards the meaning of words and is not beguiled by their sound, reads this parable with a mistrust that deepens into certainty, for the question is not of heaven but of earth. We admit that the word of the Lord is settled in heaven. What we wish to know is, whether there is any settled word of God on earth, and what and where it is. To this Dr. Clark's answer is no answer. It leaves us exactly where we were. To counsel a "childlike trust in every word of God" is to evade the question: What is the word of God? and it is no less an evasion, and it is all the more a snare, because it is spoken from a pulpit.

What is the "word of God"? The Bible? In another city sits another doctor of the same law, equally had in reputation, and at his feet are gathered a group questioning him as to the proper attitude of a Christian toward the theatre, to whom thus answers he: "*Our* conscience tells us not to go, lest at the very least we violate the command to abstain from all appearance of evil." Instantly then Dr. Clark's rock-base begins to totter and we find ourselves flat in the primeval mud, for the revised version says there is no such command; bids only to avoid every species of evil, which not only gives us no enlightenment on the question whether the theatre is evil, but forces us to ask whether "every word of God" means every word of King James's translation or every word of the revised version. Until that is decided, and because it is to be decided, and, therefore, after it is decided, our faith rests partly on a divine and partly on a human foundation. Forever, without doubt, the word of the Lord is settled in heaven, but it is so far from be-

ing settled on earth that all the churches and creeds and sects of Christendom have come into court for the purpose of settling it. When the word of God is settled on earth, earth will be earth no longer, but the Holy City—the New Jerusalem.

If the Christian faith rests on a foundation wholly divine it must be communicated at first hand by God to every human being. Every man must receive his revelation fresh from God—through no human or earthly or other medium. This, I believe, is what the Quakers teach, and their lives have been so pure, gentle, beneficent, that their belief has a good deal to say for itself. Certainly those two sons of thunder against human oppression, John Boanerges and John Greenleaf Whittier, must equally be, in the sweet, unselfish, manly character common to both, disciples whom Jesus loves.

But those of us who are not Quakers are taught from the pulpit that the revelation is not made to ourselves, but was made many years ago to a few men, by whom it was transmitted to the rest of the world. Holy men of old, moved by the Holy Ghost, spake, but they spoke in what is to us an unknown tongue. Even if they were inspired by a divine being in every word and sentence, it is nothing to us. We can not understand one word of it. I suppose there are not a hundred native American men and not ten native American women who could read a single word of what Isaiah the prophet himself wrote, or who could understand a single word if they had overheard the whole private conversation between Job and his wife. The Hebrew language reveals nothing to fifty millions of the American people. We have to depend upon some man to tell us what the letters are—what the words mean. Granting that God revealed facts to Samuel, no one claims that he has revealed Samuel to us. Practically the nineteenth century has no revelation un-

less it has one partly on a human foundation. That human foundation is the translators of Greek and Hebrew. Our revelation is by hearsay. It depends upon the fidelity, the scholarship, the mental rectitude of several men in several generations, in several countries, all purely human, for no one claims that King James's translators or the revised versionists were inspired. Alcuin and Luther and the saints of the revised version claimed no inspiration outside of their learning and their devotion. They were lights of the world, but all worldly lights are liable to flicker and to fail. Acquainted as we are with Harvard and Yale and Andover and Oxford and Heidelberg, it must be admitted that the human part of the structure of Christian faith is a little unsteady, not to say rickety. It must give a little or it must splinter. It is easy to preach every word of God so far as we know it, but a man must use his reason in order to know which is the word of God and which is the word of prejudice or passion or ignorance. Even if God inspired Matthew to write "Baptizo," he can not have inspired one man to decide that it means always to go under the water and another man that it means always or only to have a little water sprinkled on the forehead. Practically, therefore, we American republicans know no more what is meant than if the word had not been inspired at all. We must use our own reason to ascertain which and what it means. Therefore the revelation must have one pile of reason to rest on in spite of Dr. Clark. If he teaches us truly that every word of the Bible is the word of God, then either King James's translators or the revised-version clergymen are fighting against God; and among the Septuagint and Douay and Griesbach and Tischendorf, and their great host, we need a supplementary inspiration to tell us which of all these pretenders is the real word of God. One of the piles under our structure of Christian

faith is and must be reason. Even then the structure is not so firm as could be wished; but if that pile be taken away, it is not firm at all. It can not stand.

Dr. Foster sees the difficulty, and to the people gathered at his feet would fain explain it away. Not less positive and categorical, he essays a limitation and practical definition. "The Bible," he says, "is the word of God; does not simply *contain* it, but *is* it. It is inspired in every sentence, and in every word, so far as this: that it is so constructed under the control of the Holy Spirit as to convey precisely the meaning God intended. Not a single word is admitted which does not pass the scrutiny of the divine inspector as approved."

This sounds not only pious, but rigidly orthodox; yet, under scrutiny, does it really say anything? Does it in the least explain inspiration? Does it even give any practical information? Of three or four interpretations placed upon a text, where is the umpire who shall decide which *is* the meaning God intended to convey? And to whom does he intend to convey it? Where is deposited the certificate of approval from the divine inspector? Does God intend to convey to the Roman Catholics the doctrine that the Apostle Peter was the rock upon which he would build his church, and to the Protestants that that rock was Christ? If he does not, which rendering has received the warrant of the divine inspector? The clergy and the lawyers, the second best men in Massachusetts, hung and pressed to death twenty of the first best men and women, their superiors, on their own understanding of the word of God: Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live; and modern learning oversets this into: Thou shalt not suffer a witch to get her living. Did God intend to convey to Cotton Mather the mandate that Rebecca Nourse should be hanged, or did he intend to convey to the nineteenth century the idea that people

should not earn a livelihood by practicing sorcery? Without waiting for the seal of divine inspection, we—uninspired human beings, simply by studying grammar, geography and arithmetic, metaphysics, history and material science, simply, that is, by the ordinary and orderly march of the human reason—have unanimously rejected the first rendering of the word of God. If we adopt the second, do we not put God in the unhandsome and debilitated attitude of not giving men a revelation till they have found things out for themselves? While the intelligence and virtue of the Salem community were struggling in the dark, the Supreme Being gave no sign; but when intelligence has cleared for itself and for us a pathway of comparative light, and witchcraft is a lost art, and misunderstanding can do no further harm, he conveys to us his precise meaning! Is that like a God? That seems to me like a very mean and malicious man.

Dr. Foster says that "the absolute infallibility of the Scriptures will soon be beyond question among Christian thinkers, and the only questions mooted will be those of interpretation." That is a wise, not to say innocently wily way to throw heresy-hounds off the scent; but is it not rather a verbal than a real distinction?

What is the odds between a question of interpretation and a question of infallibility? If the meaning of Scriptures is impenetrable, it is little to the purpose that they are infallible. One would as soon be hanged by an interpolation as by a misunderstanding. An infallibility securely hidden in the text, dormant through ages of history, latent while interpretation is dealing death and disgrace to a baffled and virtuous world, seems hardly fitted to be a working infallibility for fallible human beings.

It amounts only to saying: The teachings of the Bible are true, but we do not know what they are.

What we want is a theory of the Bible that means something—a theory that shall make the Bible mean something to us!

A learned and venerable doctor of the law, had in reputation among all the people, expounds thus after the perfect manner of the law of the fathers: "The Bible is a unit. . . . The whole or nothing is the word of God. A revelation supported by intermittent authority, inspired in patches and parentheses, we may be very sure is not a revelation either of God or from God. Its structure is not Godlike."

"There are three that bear record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one." That is our Bible, which our ancestors bequeathed, which they believed in, which we received. But the revised version leaves this out altogether. Is the revised version, then, rejecting the word of God? Or did King James's translators put in the words of men as the words of God? How are we to know? If we give up this verse, as the revisionists bid us, we must give up the whole Bible, for "the whole or nothing is the word of God." If the revisionists are right, our ancestral Bible was inspired in patches, and this piece between patches the revisionists cut out and threw away, and, to be logical and theological, we must follow suit and throw the whole Bible away!

"The Lord gave the word; great was the company of those that published it." So ring the voices of Dr. Reynolds and his host at Hampton Court, singing the Psalms of David, but the translators of a later time tune their harps to another key: "The Lord gave the word. The women that publish the tidings are a great host." Must we throw away the Bible unless that great host of women is drawn off from it. It looks as if the seventeenth-century translators thought those women ought not to have been there, and simply and succinctly translated

them out of sight, without regard to King David's honorable award, without the slightest conscientious scruple concerning fidelity to the text. But time rolled on, and women's colleges sprang up, and women's boards were formed, and when the nineteenth-century translators sat down to their task it was thought best to bring the women back again where they belonged. And have not women—it is, to be sure, a mere side-issue—by this token a special and prescriptive right to expound and promulgate the word of God, being celebrated by King David for so doing?

Can it be said that the translators were not inspired, and that we must go back to the original writers for the text which they directly received from Heaven? Not only does this leave the great majority of human beings without any authoritative revelation—since we, the unlearned, can not read the Hebrew and Greek originals—but the learned are no better off than we, for they differ about the original text as widely as they differ about the translations. There does not exist in the whole world a Bible, a unit, a whole, of which we can say, or of which the most learned scriptural scholar can say, this is the original, real, undisputed Bible, given by God to man. On the contrary, when we go behind the translations to the original book, we are launched on a whirlpool of contradictions, for the Bible, through many centuries, did not exist as a unit. The dates of the different books composing it are different, distant, and doubtful. The number of manuscripts in which these various books are found is uncounted. Many of them were lost before our literature began. The variations of text are also innumerable. If the Bible is in every part and parcel the word of God—if the Bible as a unit, as a solid body, is the word of God—of which no part can be lost or rejected without losing or rejecting the whole, then are we of all men

most miserable, for in the lapse of ages and the lack of literary and scientific culture certainty about the Bible text is absolutely unattainable. The word of God is in inextricable confusion and God has left himself without witness in the book of books.

If a theory of inspiration can be formed which shall not only leave us our Bible, in spite of all debate and discussion about the text, but which shall cause all this debate and discussion to bring out in bolder lines and stronger light the divine origin of the Bible and its marvelous adaptation to human need and to the human constitution, would there not be a presumption in its favor?

No, is the reply, because if the whole Bible is not the word of God, whose is the prerogative to sit in judgment for us and tell us where error ends and truth begins?

The answer ought to be easy and natural; the prerogative is our own. God has given to every man the means to do it. The Logos, the logical faculty, Reason, is the true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world. That light, faint though it be, is a true spark kindled from the divine light ineffable. In the beginning was the Logos, the Reason, and Reason was God. In Reason is light, and that light is the life of men. By the endowment of reason is the life of man raised above the life of beasts and akin to the life of God. Professor Phelps would give the prerogative to sit in judgment for us and tell us what the word of God is, to groups of men in remote times, in distant nations—men whom we call Augustine, Calvin, Wycliff—great men in their day, who did great work for us, but who were not heirs of all the ages that have poured their golden treasure into our coffers; men who make it impossible to receive their conclusions because they contradict each other, but whose unwearying work helps us to form conclusions of our own. Cardinal Newman and Cardinal Manning confer the pre-

rogative of judging revelation upon great companies of men in all Christian ages, whom they call the Church, but who also contradict each other tooth and nail. The one group brings forward as proof of their ministry, "All scripture is given by inspiration of God," and the other, "On this rock will I build my church," and the one is just as pertinent to the sufficiency and the exclusiveness of Biblical authority as is the other to the sufficiency and the exclusiveness of ecclesiastical authority, and that is not at all. For the same scripture which declares its own inspiration declares also the inspiration of reason. The inspiration of the Almighty giveth understanding, and the rock on which the Church was built was no man but Christ, the Son of the living God. The Catholic may insist upon the narrowest point of verbal collocation, and because Peter is followed by *this*, has some verbal ground for saying that Peter, and not Christ, is the rock of our salvation, but the Protestant has no canon by which he can dislodge the inspiration of his own reason and retain the inspiration of the Bible, for the Bible itself declares that the inspiration of the Almighty giveth understanding.

It is maintained that "the plain Christian believer feels the need of a revelation from God which is authoritatively Godlike." But how does the plain Christian believer know what is Godlike? In no way but by his own reason. Are we then to assume the position that human reason is capable of judging what kind of revelation men ought to have, but is not capable of judging what kind of a revelation men have received; is capable of defining beforehand what God ought to do, but is incapable of discerning afterward whether he has done it or not; is capable of saying authoritatively and outside of the Bible what is Godlike, but is not to be trusted to say what is Godlike within the Bible? To me it seems more modest and reverent, as well as more scientific, to study the rev-

elation we have than to limn the revelation we ought to have. God is to be discovered, not simply by imagining what he ought to be, but by seeking what he actually is from his footsteps, as seen in the worlds of matter, of action, and of spirit; for all worlds are his, and through all worlds he reveals himself.

The consequences of a true theory of the Bible do not diminish the stress of truth; but there are no consequences to be feared. Men apprehend and declare that if the Bible only contains the word of God, and is not in every part and parcel the word of God, the inevitable sequence will be "that the major part of the Old Testament, to-day and to us, has no more moral authority than the Vedas. Whether it has as much, what means has the unlettered mind of knowing?"

It has at least the means of reading the Vedas and comparing them with the Scriptures.

But the unlettered mind can not read the Vedas. Therein lies the gist of the argument. The Vedas have never had sufficient moral impulsion to get themselves translated for us, and transported to us, and transplanted in us. We know practically, religiously, nothing whatever about the Vedas. The Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments we do know, although the work is just as Oriental as the Vedas. From being the sacred books of a primitive tribe, of a small province, of a scattered and homeless race, they have insinuated themselves into the very heart and life and control of the widest and highest nineteenth-century civilization, the most powerful and practical civilization in the history of humanity. All the churches of Christendom are founded on them. All the politics of Christendom are amenable to them. All the character of Christendom is molded by them, so far as moral improvement is recognized. The unlettered mind knows nothing about the Vedas, and it knows more

about the Bible than about any other book in the world. It knows that the Bible has more moral authority than the Vedas, because it feels and recognizes the authority of the Bible, and does not know the Vedas, although they are the sacred books of a notably intellectual and metaphysical people.

What the world needs just now is not a new religion, but a more accurate knowledge of the old religion. Church-of-Englandism is not the old religion. Roman-Catholicism is not the old religion. Congregationalism, Unitarianism, Presbyterianism is not the old religion. They are all different forms of paganism. All form considered as religion is paganism. This is not to say that they are bad. All paganism is not bad. But God is a spirit, and the only real worship of him is in spirit and in truth.

Christianity is the spiritual truth of all the ages, irrespective of all forms, distilled from all sources, forever vitalized with the power of an endless life in Jesus Christ our Lord. All the conflict comes from taking the Church as spiritual authority, instead of taking the authority of one's own reason, upon the words of Christ, the work of God. Everything which substitutes authority for reason is to that extent paganism. Reason is God's own revelation to every man. He may use his reason in judging authority, but nothing has authority except so far as it is founded on reason.

Mr. Gladstone but falls into the way of error when he says of the new religion—Christianity without Christ—that it abolishes, of course, the whole authority of Scripture. Scripture itself has no authority outside itself—outside, that is, of its own reasonableness. The Scripture writers never hesitate to abolish each other's authority. Isaiah swept away the ground from under the feet of Moses. Paul withstood Peter to the face because he was

to be blamed. Christ in so many words affirmed that the great Jewish law-giver had compromised with sin and framed iniquity into a law which was not the upright law of the beginning. The Bible has no authority except that of right reason in the reasoning animal—man—and this is the claim, and the only claim, which the Bible itself makes.

Josephus placed the legislation and the statesmanship of Moses on a solid rock from which eighteen centuries have not dislodged it; have but confirmed its strength as an impregnable basis:

"I exhort all those that peruse these books to apply their minds to God, and to examine the mind of our legislator, whether he hath not understood his nature in a manner worthy of him; and hath not ever ascribed to him such operations as become his power; and hath not preserved his writings from those indecent fables which others have framed; although by the great distance of time when he lived he might have securely forged such lies, for he lived two thousand years ago, at which vast distance of ages the poets themselves have not been so hardy as to fix even the generations of their gods, much less the actions of their men, or their own laws.

"But because almost all our constitution depends on the wisdom of Moses, our legislator . . . the reader is to know that Moses deemed it exceeding necessary that he who should conduct his own life well, and give laws to others, in the first place, should consider the divine nature; and upon the contemplations of God's operations, should thereby imitate the best of all patterns, so far as it is possible for human nature to do, and to endeavor to follow after it; neither could the legislator himself have a right mind without such a contemplation, nor would anything he should write tend to the promotion of virtue in his readers: I mean unless they be taught, first of all,

that God is the Father and Lord of all things, and sees all things, and that thence he bestows a happy life upon those that follow him, but plunges such as do not walk in the paths of virtue into inevitable miseries. Now, when Moses was desirous to teach this lesson to his countrymen, he did not begin the establishment of his laws after the same manner that other legislators did—I mean, upon contracts and other rights between one man and another—but by raising their minds upward to regard God and his creation of the world, and by persuading them that we men are the most excellent of the creatures of God upon earth. Now, when once he had brought them to submit to religion, he easily persuaded them to submit in all other things; for as to other legislators, they followed fables, and by their discourses transferred the most reproachful of human vices unto the gods, and so afforded wicked men the most plausible excuses for their crimes; but as for our legislator, when he had once demonstrated that God was possessed of perfect virtue, he supposed that men also ought to strive after the participation of it; and on those who did not so think and so believe he inflicted the severest punishments. . . . There is nothing therein disagreeable either to the majesty of God or to his love of mankind."

Thus nobly did the pious Jew apprehend the truth which his nation was elected to hold and declare in the beginning—God.

What is the claim of the testimony of the Bible itself? A plenary, literal, mechanical inspiration is the device of Scripture commentators; not the assertion of the Scripture writers.

All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, but also the inspiration of the Almighty giveth understanding, and whatever of divine clings herein to the Bible clings equally to man's reason. Holy men of God spake, moved

by the Holy Ghost, but every good gift is from above, from the Father of light, and therefore *every* word of truth must be inspired by the Holy Ghost, who is again and again delineated by Christ as the Spirit of Truth, the Comforter, an immanent and prevailing Spirit. The apostle Paul claimed to have received the Holy Spirit and to speak with tongues, yet affirmed that it amounted to nothing if he had not love; showing that whatever of inspiration he had in writing his letters was less than the inspiration of love—which is common to all.

Whatever this inspiration is, the Old and the New agree that it is universal. It is promised to every one: All thy children shall be taught of the Lord. Jeremiah had a very short way to find out what was the word of God. The land was full of pretended prophets, who were deceiving the people with their "Thus saith the Lord." If they did not *profit* the people they were not authoritative! Moses warned them in the same succinct way—if a prophet arose among them commanding to forsake God and go after false gods, he was no prophet. The test of the Lord is to hate evil. The divine authority of the Scriptures is by the Scripture writers based upon their righteousness. So much of truth as they teach, so much are they inspired. Scripture appeals, notwithstanding Dr. Clark, to our ethical consciousness. The historical authority of Scripture appeals to our trained historical consciousness. And, best of all, to those whose historic consciousness is little trained comes the assurance of Christ himself: If any man *will do God's will* he shall know of the doctrine. A truth well comprehended and confirmed by Pastor Robinson, the father and founder of New England, the great leader of Congregationalism:

"The best and safest way is to get true and sound conscience of things certain and without controversy. Such a person God will direct in his ways so far and cer-

tainly as not to miss of the main end—eternal life; and therewith in mercy will pardon all other of his human aberrations."

"Who knoweth with how little God can and doth save many, being faithful in learning what they can, and in observing what they know?"

"He who gets this general grace, to have his heart indeed and seriously bent upon the course of piety toward God and innocency toward men, the Lord will not so far suffer to err in his way as to miss of heaven in the end, notwithstanding his particular aberrations of human frailty, which God will cover under the veil of his rich mercy by the person's sincere faith and general repentance."

Do the right and you will know the doctrine, whether it be of God or of man. Moral rectitude is the safest guide to mental accuracy. Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above. What is not good, what is not perfect, is not from above.

That loosening of the moral authority of the major part of the Old Testament to-day, and to us, which is foreboded as the result of not considering every part and parcel of the Bible to be the word of God, is a loosening which has already occurred even under the theory that the Bible is a solid, a unit. Orthodox or heretic, we no more observe the Levitical law than if it were inculcated in the Vedas. Why is it more dangerous to say that the Levitical law has no authority for us than it is for us to pay no heed to it? Why is it more heretical to say that a law is obsolete, than it is constantly to disregard it? The most conservative and orthodox portion of the religious world has done precisely what it is striving to prevent the advancing regiment of the religious army from doing to-day; it has rightly divided the word of God. Reverently and devoutly studying the Scriptures,

it has decided and taught that what was imperative and elevating for the Jews is inappropriate and retrogressive for us. It takes this unit, this solid, this Bible, every word the word of God, and it says of one part: This is the ceremonial law, and we need not observe it; and of another part: This is moral law, and it is binding on us. By what right, on whose authority, does it limit one word of God to the Jews of Palestine, and spread another word of God over all the world? By right of its own reason. But no pretensions of heterodoxy or heresy can be more radical than this. Unless a clergyman worships God with a candlestick of pure gold, six branches coming out of the sides of it, three branches of the candlestick out of the one side, and three branches of the candlestick out of the other side; three bowls made like unto almonds, with a knop and a flower in one branch, and three bowls made like almonds in the other branch, with a knop and a flower; four bowls made like unto almonds, with their knops and their flowers, a knop under two branches of the same, and a knop under two branches of the same, and a knop under two branches of the same, according to the six branches that proceed out of the candlestick, their knops and their branches of the same, all of it one beaten work of pure gold, there is a considerable part of the Old Testament which has with him no more moral authority than the Vedas. There is, therefore, now no condemnation to them who would bring to any other part of Scripture as devout a heart, as close a scrutiny, as wise a discrimination, as all clergymen have brought to the law of the Lord delivered to Moses upon the mount of Sinai.

The word of God in Genesis says that Israel bowed himself upon the bed's head. The word of God in Hebrews says Jacob worshiped leaning upon the top of his staff. Alford renders out the *leaning*, and says that

Jacob worshiped upon the top of his staff. The Vulgate still further takes out *upon*, and says that Jacob worshiped the top of his staff. The learned Dean says it was Jacob's own staff upon which he leaned. Dr. Taylor says it was Joseph's staff. Professor Thayer says that Jacob did not worship at all, but simply paid homage to Joseph after the Egyptian fashion, as a high officer of state. *Every* word the word of God? Whose—Thayer's or Alford's, the Vulgate or the Septuagint, Genesis or Hebrews?

Is not this staff of Israel a very bruised reed to lean on? If the true principle is that the Bible is a solid, a unit, every word the word of God, and that we can not throw away one part without throwing away all—then we must give up the Bible with its legacy of love and truth and comfort and hope, with all its sacredness of generations, because the vowel points were not invented in season for the Septuagint translators to know whether the word was *hamittah*—bed, or *hamatteh*—staff; because M. Chabas was not born soon enough to tell King James's translators that bowing one's self on the superior's staff of office was an ordinary Egyptian mode of recognizing the superior's authority. Must we sink in the troublous ocean of life, unbuoyed, unsustained by the word of God unless we have the head of Jacob's bed to float on?

But to some minds any other theory involves absurdity. "That he has given to a lost world a book inspired here and not inspired there, historic now and mythic then, blundering sometimes and by hap right at other times, and that he has left it to man's infirm intuitions to divine whether it is oracular anywhere is absurd. It is not like God to build such a rickety structure."

But to me it seems exactly like God. What can be a more rickety structure than this world which he has made? Doubtless to its creator's eye it goes on its stately

course undisturbed in eternal order, but to us who live in it, what ricketiness ! It is shaken by earthquakes, it is pierced by lightnings, it is swept by cyclones. The sea plucks at the land. The land slips under the sea. The rivers ravage the meadows. Vineyards are overwhelmed by volcanoes. Man is born upon earth and he can not emigrate to another planet. Fastened to this, he is yet preyed upon by fire and water, and bug and beast. And what a rickety structure is man himself !—complicate and wonderful in design, but so imperfectly completed, so ill-adapted to his surroundings, that multitudes perish before the journey of life is fairly begun, and multitudes more sink by the wayside from pain and weariness. Of all the millions born, so rickety is the world-construction that the number is infinitesimal who pass, without pain or trouble, through well-rounded days to the full complement of their years, and enter heaven gently, from glory to glory. It is such a rickety world, such a piece of damaged goods, a machine so out of gearing, that science agrees with theology in calling it "a hurt world, a lost world." If the structure of inspiration given by God is to correspond to the structure of the world made by God, it must have one pervading and prevailing principle of life, a continuous and upward line of movement; but it must be very rickety in that part of its construction which comes within human experience.

This absurd book is exactly what has been given us—a book inspired here and not inspired there. "I command," says Paul; "not I, but the Lord." And soon after he adds, "The rest speak I, not the Lord"—a specific declaration that his word is inspired here and not inspired there. "Historic now and mythic then." Certainly. David was undoubtedly the historic king in Jerusalem. The tempter of Eve was as undoubtedly a mythic snake. So the Bible itself tells us hundreds of years afterward,

for the serpent which coils itself into the first book as a beast of the field is cast out of the last as Satan, which deceiveth the whole world. "Blundering sometimes, and by hap right at other times." Yes, Peter was right when he pronounced, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," and he received the solemn confirmation, "Upon this rock will I build my church." But he blundered straightway in contradicting Jesus, and was instantly and unflinchingly rebuked. "Get thee behind me, Satan. . . .Thou art an offense unto me."

What is "infallibility"? What is "authority"? What is "inspiration"? Is not a stress often laid upon the words which is wholly unwarranted? Suppose we admit—leaving aside all questions of text and translation—that the whole Bible, as a unit, is inspired and infallible; do we mean that Abraham was directed by God to offer up his son Isaac, or that Moses was directed by God to tell the story? Suppose both, what of it? Suppose the book of Genesis to be infallible, what of it? To whom does it give authority to do what? Suppose the book of Exodus to be inspired, infallible, and authoritative in every part and parcel, what of it? Assuming that God did direct the Jewish master to bring his faithful servant to the door-post, and bore his ear through with an awl, no American master is authorized to do the same. To a bad servant he would sometimes like to do it, but the law would not allow it. The servant would not permit it. Suppose Matthew was divinely inspired to narrate the story of the tribute-money found in the fish, we are not ordered to pay our taxes by such recourse. There is hardly a word in the Old Testament, there are not many words in the New Testament, directly addressed to us. Most of both is narrative, directions, sermons, songs, remonstrances, arguments—all with a strong personal bearing upon men who have been dead for generations. The

stress of these instructions has quietly lapsed with the lapse of time, with the change of institutions. Whether God told the Scripture writers in so many words what to say, or whether their inspiration was through genius, enthusiasm, love to God, love to man, spiritual uplifting, just the same have we all—Professor Phelps and Professor Park, Andover, and Bangor, and Princeton, and Washington, and all the pulpits, Congregational, Baptist, Episcopal, Unitarian—taken liberties with it, taken leave to say what part we would accept and what part we would reject, what part we would practice and what part we would discard. God said: Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy, but Dr. Douglas practically says: Not so, Lord, I will remember the Sunday to keep it holy. God says: The garments which the priests shall wear are a breastplate, and ephod, and a robe, and a broidered coat, and a miter, and a girdle; but the most conservative clergyman prefers a plain clerical suit, even when he addresses us upon the necessity of having a theory of inspiration "*which makes the authority of the Scriptures imperative!*"

Inculcating the necessity of the literal verbal plenary inspiration of the Bible, orthodoxy makes merry—gently—over Starr King's attempted explanation of inspiration: "It is—hm—it is a kind of mental uplifting; it is an illumination; it is—well, it is an *inspiration* of the whole man." We must have something better than this, protests orthodoxy. "We must have the doctrine in a bold and decisive form," which "plain men" can *use*. And for Mr. King's glittering and sounding generalities it substitutes something which must "make the Bible resonant with the very voice of God. It must be something which the soul can hear in the far distance, when conscious of estrangement from its Maker. It must give visions of truth which men can see in the dark."

This is lofty and admirable. I think it is also true. My theory of inspiration does all this. But it seems to leave as much to the imagination as did Starr King's definition. A theory that gives visions of truth which men can see in the dark is certainly and markedly a theory of "illumination." "Plain men" will find no more difficulty in grasping the theory of a "mental uplifting" than a theory "which the soul can hear in the far distance."

But, says the fearsome saint, "a theory of inspiration, of which the final outcome is that Moses contradicted Christ, that the imprecations of David conflict with the epistles of John, and that St. Paul could not even repeat himself correctly, abrogates all claim of the Scriptures to imperative and divine authority. God has not thus contradicted God."

No, but it is not the theory that causes the contradictions. The contradictions cause the theory! The contradictions are there. What we want is a theory that shall take *them* in without throwing the Bible away. God has not contradicted God, therefore there are no contradictions, says the old philosophy. God has not contradicted God, therefore the contradictions are not of God, says the new philosophy. One might as well deny day and night as deny the contradictions. "Thou shalt cause a bullock to be brought before the tabernacle of the congregation," says the Lord through Moses, "and thou shalt kill the bullock before the Lord, by the door of the tabernacle of the congregation. And thou shalt take of the blood of the bullock, and put it upon the horns of the altar with thy finger, and pour all the blood beside the bottom of the altar . . . it is a sin offering." Speaking through Isaiah, God says, with every mark of disgust, "I delight not in the blood of bullocks. Who hath required this at your hand? Bring no more vain oblations!"

"He shall burn a perpetual incense before the Lord throughout your generations," says God in Exodus. "Incense is an abomination unto me," says God in Isaiah.

The service of the Lord in the Chronicles required the Levites to offer all burnt sacrifices unto the Lord in the Sabbaths, in the new moons, and on the set feasts, continually before the Lord. But in Isaiah the Lord said: "The new moons and Sabbaths I can not away with! Your new moons and your appointed feasts my soul hateth."

"Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife?" asked the Pharisees, tempting Christ.

"What did Moses command you?" he replied, warily.

"Moses suffered to put her away," they said.

"For the hardness of your heart," answered Jesus, "he wrote you this precept. But from the beginning of the creation God made them male and female. What, therefore, God hath joined together, let no man put asunder."

Can contradiction be sharper? Does not our Lord apparently summon Moses for the very purpose of contradicting him? Is it any theory about inspiration that makes these contradictions? Is there any theory in earth or heaven that can make them anything but contradictions? Must we throw away the Bible because Moses and Isaiah contradict each other, or throw away our own reason by asserting that they do not contradict each other? Never! Neither! But with the golden thread of truth and righteousness running unbroken through both, and by aid of these very contradictions showing the development of human reason under the cherishing light of the divine reason, let us weave a theory of inspiration which shall fit the facts of earth, and to that extent at least must be the inspiration of heaven.

But such a theory, says theology, would give us a volume which it is not "like man to interpret truthfully.

The uncultured mind can not solve the riddle of such a book." Yet even on the rigid old solid unit theory, the Bible has not been truthfully interpreted. The uncultured and the cultured mind have alike failed to solve its riddles. It was because they looked upon the Bible as a unit, solid, inelastic, without perspective, inspired everywhere alike, never contradicting itself, oracular everywhere, that men hanged witches. Slavery in the Southern States planted itself flatfooted on the law of Moses, and stood there. Polygamy transplants the institutions of Abraham and Isaac and Jacob into modern Christendom, and breathes out threatenings and slaughter against the spirit of Christ. There is hardly an evil institution, hardly an evil deed under the sun, which the Bible does not buttress if the Bible is to be taken at the foot of the letter, solid, square to scientific statement, a formula, like the multiplication table.

Any other than this solid unit theory is spoken of as a new theory, a new departure. But there is nothing new about it. It is the oldest theory there is. It is as old as the Bible.

New England theology especially has no right to call it new.

Pastor Robinson, in whom all Congregationalists live and move and have their ecclesiastical being, renounced for himself and for his followers all attachment to any mere human systems or expositions of Scriptures, reserved an entire and eternal liberty of studying the Bible and forming their own principles and practices for themselves from what their own reason should discover in the Bible. His preface to his Defense of Dort Calvinism said: "It is true we ought not to pin our faith on the sleeves of any, nor to call any man master, as Christ speaks and means, but him alone."

Again he says: "The custom of the Church is but

the custom of men; the sentence of the fathers is but the opinion of men; the determination of councils but the judgment of men, what men soever."

"Some are so servilely in bondage to the determinations of certain doctors as that they think nothing well done in religion which these teach not; and some of these are so transported with waspish zeal as they can scarcely, without a fit of an ague, either speak to or think of him who a little steps out of their tread."

"I profess myself always one of them who still desire to learn further or better what the good will of God is."

"I will not justify all the words of another man, nor yet mine own."

"*The meanest man's reason,* SPECIALLY IN MATTER OF FAITH AND OBEDIENCE TO GOD, *is to be preferred before all authority of all other men.*"

"Men are often accounted heretics with greater sin through want of charity in the judges than in the judged through want of faith."

Richard Baxter, whose orthodoxy no one will question, had no fears of the higher criticism, raised no claim for a solid Bible, a unit, or no Bible at all, but affirmed almost as a truism:

"The Old Testament letter (written as we have it about Ezra's time) is that vehicle which is as imperfect as the revelation of these times was . . . so that he that doubteth of the truth of some words in the Old Testament, or of some circumstances in the New, hath no reason therefore to doubt of the Christian religion."

This appears to have been the opinion which prevailed among the divines of the Westminster Assembly.

"Reason," says Bishop Butler, "is the only faculty we have wherewith to judge concerning anything, even revelation itself."

Who has ever made a more radical, a more "free-thinking" statement?

"It is of much more importance," says Origen, "to give our assent to doctrines upon grounds of reason and wisdom than on that of faith merely."

"Which subject he (Cyprian) did not handle as he ought to have done, for he (Demetrius) ought to have been refuted, not by the testimonies of Scripture, which he plainly considered vain, fictitious, and false, but by arguments and reason."

Thus, all along the way a clean, clear path has been stamped by the strong, steady feet of thinkers fighting for reason when reason meant chains and stake and cross, and we who have entered into their rest but never into their labors, we Agnostics, Radicals, "New Departure" folk, we pipe a languid note for reason, and on the strength of it call ourselves original and heroic, the slaves of thought.

As a Mosaic institute, as a Pauline dialectic, as a theological issue, as a Congregational question, Miss Breckenridge bears so directly on the doctrine of inspiration that she needs no apology for an introduction.

Professor Foster informs us that Miss Juanita Breckenridge, a student in Oberlin Theological Seminary, applied for the customary license to preach the Gospel to the Cleveland Conference, at its recent meeting at North Amherst, Ohio, April 16, 1890, in connection with the other members of the seminary who applied in accordance with the usage of the churches.

The application, after a considerable discussion—which did not attack the examination sustained by the young lady, which was, indeed, eminently satisfactory—was laid upon the table till the fall meeting of the Conference. The matter is therefore before the denomination for discussion.

Professor Howe hopes "that it will be discussed as a question of positive religion. The apostle Paul, in the first Epistle to Timothy, expressly forbids that women should 'teach.' The passage is the one in which he lays down those general directions concerning the ministry which constitute the very foundation of the sacred office. It begins with the office of public prayer. This is committed to men in distinction from women, and the reason upon which the prohibition is grounded is founded in the creation, in the history of the fall of man, and in the relations of sex. The passage passes then to the immediate consideration of the qualifications of bishops. Text and context determine the meaning of the apostolic prohibition, and that is that while woman is a daughter of Eve, and while she still remains a woman, she can not authoritatively 'teach,' or do precisely that which Miss Breckenridge desires to do when she applies for a license. So it would appear to be a question simply whether Christianity is a positive religion, which binds Congregationalists, or else whether the interpretation of this passage which has been almost universally given is correct. We hope the discussion will follow this line."

And perhaps the highest Congregational authority pronounces more formal judgment after giving what seems to be a fair and full statement of the case: "Our ministry and our churches have almost uniformly regarded the family, and not the individual, as the social unit; and have understood Paul [I Cor. xi, 3–16; xiv, 34, 35; Eph. v, 22–24; and especially I Tim. ii, 11–13] as teaching, as plainly as it is within the power of human language to teach, that Christianity does not, as the rule, whatever may be true in rarely exceptional cases, recognize any right of woman in the pulpit. In recent years men have arisen, like the late Mr. Beecher, who

have argued that times have so changed that, were Paul now alive, he would teach a different gospel on this subject. Such a suggestion seems to us squarely in the face of any effectual doctrine of divine inspiration. If the Scriptures can be modified in their tone of truth by what somebody thinks their authors would say, were they writing to-day, the word of the Lord does not stand as Isaiah said it did, while the grass withers and the flower fades. We hope our brethren will have grace to settle this question as God wants it settled."

Thus it seems that, as plainly as it is within the power of human language to teach, Paul teaches that Miss Breckenridge must not preach ; and to teach otherwise is to stand squarely in the face of any effectual doctrine of divine inspiration.

Happily the texts are given which bear on Miss Breckenridge. Let us examine them, noting, however, first, that if the Scriptures are not to be modified by times and seasons, the ceremonial law of the Jews is of full obligation in America at this day :

I Corinthians, xi, 3–16.

"But I would have you know, that the head of every man is Christ ; and the head of the woman is the man ; and the head of Christ is God. Every man praying or prophesying, having his head covered, dishonoreth his head. But every woman that prayeth or prophesieth with her head uncovered dishonoreth her head : for that is even all one as if she were shaven. For if the woman be not covered, let her also be shorn : but if it be a shame for a woman to be shorn or shaven, let her be covered. For a man indeed ought not to cover his head, forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God : but the woman is the glory of the man. For the man is not of the woman ; but the woman of the man. Neither was the man created for the woman ; but the woman for the man.

For this cause ought the woman to have power on her head, because of the angels. Nevertheless neither is the man without the woman, neither the woman without the man, in the Lord. For as the woman is of the man, even so is the man also by the woman ; but all things of God. Judge in yourselves : is it comely that a woman pray unto God uncovered ? Doth not even nature itself teach you, that, if a man have long hair, it is a shame unto him ? But if a woman have long hair, it is a glory to her : for her hair is given her for a covering. But if any man seem to be contentious, we have no such custom, neither the churches of God."

It requires heroic self-control not to give the exegesis which this most interesting passage prompts, but we must keep to the point, which is Miss Breckenridge ; and all that Paul has to say about Miss Breckenridge is that she should preach with her head covered. He not only does not refuse to recognize her license to preach and to pray in public, but he distinctly recognizes both—if she wears a bonnet ! More than that, he refuses to continue the argument, even if she will not wear her bonnet. He says what he thinks is proper, but if any man is contentious, Paul declines to waste time over that ; he waives it aside with the simple remark, "It is not our way," and goes on to more important matters.

But what of the reasoning that would make such a text prove such a conclusion or stand squarely in the face of inspiration ?

I Corinthians, xiv, 34, 35.

"Let your women keep silence in the churches : for it is not permitted unto them to speak ; but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law. And if they will learn anything, let them ask their husbands at home : for it is a shame for women to speak in the church."

Observe that Paul does not say, "let all women keep silent in the churches," but "let *your* women"—the women of the noisy, clamorous, unruly Corinthian church, to whom his letter is specifically addressed. There is no question of pulpit, or teaching, or preaching, but of women starting up in the pews to interrupt the preaching with questions. He does not say, "if they wish to preach or teach anything, let them ask their husbands at home, but if they will *learn* anything let them ask their husbands at home." He is trying to bring order and decorum into a new and turbulent church. Even the men are like grown-up boys—delighted with their new liberty but not half comprehending it, and altogether running riot. In a hundred ways, gently but most urgently, he tries to curb them with every consideration of worldliness and unworldliness; to keep them from talking all together and making a nuisance and scandal of their meeting. He shows them how absurd it is, how useless, how mischievous. He tells them when they ought to speak, how many may speak at once, when they ought to be silent talking only to themselves and to God, giving them the most minute directions with a reasonable and delicate persuasiveness. It was a troublesome and thankless task, and when he turns to the women he evidently sees that it is hopeless. Even Paul abandons the situation and says simply: "Do not you talk at all"; and I think we all agree that he took the wisest course.

But what of the reasoning that says unless the directions given to the disorderly female chatterers in the Corinthian churches, where the men were chattering as noisily, and were curbed as strenuously, short of being absolutely silenced—unless these directions apply to Miss Breckenridge, able, educated, and desiring to preach the Gospel with perfect decorum and the full consent of

her congregation—there is no effective doctrine of divine inspiration?

EPHESIANS, v, 22–24.

"Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord. For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church: and he is the saviour of the body. Therefore as the church is subject unto Christ, so let the wives be to their own husbands in everything."

As plainly as human language can teach, this seems to teach that if a man wishes his wife to preach, she must; and if he is willing she should preach, she may; and that Miss Breckenridge, having no husband at all, may do as she chooses.

And especially

I TIMOTHY, ii, 12–14.

"But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence. For Adam was first formed, then Eve. And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression."

Paul may seem to have been a little hard pushed for argument, but it answered his purpose perfectly with the audience he was addressing. We, however, are concerned only *in re* Juanita Breckenridge, who has no desire to usurp authority over the man in teaching and preaching, but asks authority from man to teach and preach. Paul having previously enjoined upon woman to be well dressed when she was preaching, and to preach if her husband wished her to preach, how can this command to women not to speak at all unless they can speak in an orderly and legitimate way apply to Miss Breckenridge, who asks in the orderly and legitimate way for permission to preach?

And what of the reasoning that squarely refuses any effectual doctrine of divine inspiration unless Paul speaks to the Oberlin graduates and the Smith College gradu-

ates, and the Wellesley and the Vassar graduates, in the words that he spoke to the Corinthian neophytes eighteen hundred years ago?

Listening to such exegesis from the lips of men, I am ready to believe that there is a loud call for Miss Juanita Breckenridge in the pulpit.

Surely there is something to be learned from the words and the attitude of Christ toward women. He paid to their intelligence the exquisite compliment of addressing it. As Dr. Donaldson has reminded us, with a woman he held the most profound conversation, and to a woman he proclaimed the grandest truths of his revelation. A woman, in her enthusiasm, entered the room where Christ was dining as a guest, to pay her costly tribute of adoration, and was not only not rebuked, but has been immortalized by the expressed approbation of our Lord. In his Oriental nation, Christ and his mother mingled with equal freedom among host and guests. His intimacy with the family at Bethany took in the sisters—even the housekeeping sister—to as lofty and intellectual an intercourse as the brother; and his first appearance after the resurrection was to a woman. All the mildness and lenity and consideration of Christ were lavished on women. I do not remember that to any woman, however erring, Christ showed token of displeasure or condemnation, or aught more severe than a grave and gentle benignity. His few words of wrath and rebuke were for men.

Is there any reason why the test of Jeremiah should not be applied to the female prophets? If they *profit* the people, they speak the words of the Lord.

The New Testament is nearer to us in time and in social organization than the Old Testament. Indeed, society at the time and in the country of the birth of Christ was more like the nineteenth century than almost any

subsequent century. And as the New Testament was in a sense the culmination of the Old, embodying the biography and preaching of our Lord, it is to the Old Testament as sunshine to twilight; but the twilight is from the same sun, and it is the twilight of the dawn, and not the coming night. We should not countenance the idea that the New Testament has any more claim on us than the Old. The Old Testament is the story of God's shining pathway through the life of man, leading to his fullest revelation in Christ. The New Testament is the record of the manifestation of God in Christ. Neither is a book of precepts for us. Both are books of principles and spirit which we must apply to our own life on our own responsibility. The precepts of the Old and the New Testaments were for the persons to whom they were addressed—to all the world only so far as circumstances make them applicable. Of that every man is his own judge. We suffer not the authority of Moses to prevail against Sunday worship, and there is no more reason why we should quote Paul against Miss Breckenridge, now that she wants a license to preach from Oberlin College, than there is why we should quote Moses against a clergyman's frock-coat.

The hosts of learned men and women who are devoting their lives to the Pentateuch and the prophets, and the other hosts who are digging in the sacred soil, searching for the hidden treasures of buried cities, only show how deep a hold this revelation of God has taken on the hearts of men. In all these studies, in all these excavations, the Bible is the mainspring and guiding spirit—nay, not only the guiding spirit, but literally the guide-book.

M. Naville, the persistent and successful Egyptian explorer, recently made a statement, at the Victoria Institute in London, of the discoveries which he has just made; and quoted the prophecy of Ezekiel against Egypt, because it contained the names of the leading

buried cities, the recovery of whose records he is desirous to secure. The greatest and most successful Egyptian explorer of modern times goes to prophecy for light to enable him to find that which others had failed to discover, thus taking the Bible as the little red Baedeker of his Egyptian travels.

He informs us that he had found two statues of Apepi, the Pharaoh of Joseph, and inscriptions in regard to the Pharaoh of the Exodus, and says: "I can not dwell at great length here on the events of the Exodus, yet I should like to mention that the successive discoveries made in the Delta have had the result of making the sacred narrative more comprehensible in many points."

But in endeavoring to become acquainted with the Bible, to yield ourselves to its divine inspiration, the very first thing is to get rid of false theories of inspiration, that shut out its light and arrest its influence. They have been chiefly mischievous in this: that when men began to doubt *them* they began also to doubt the Bible itself. But the impulse caused by a little doubt is checked by a continuous, a widening, and a deepening knowledge which is setting the word of God on an immutable basis. In this effort the Bible combines with human reason, acting on science, on explorations, on all human observation to justify and elucidate itself. A mysterious inward quality, an unexplained prescience, an insight—not only moral, but scientific—in the Bible, is coming out under the fervent, clear light of modern research, of keen investigation; so strong, so indisputable, so startling that it has already called a halt upon induction, just as rationalism called a halt upon the old manufactured, illiterate, impossible interpretation. Reason itself must wait for facts. The Bible is proved by its works. By its fruits we know it. Its divine certificate is its compelling force, its pervasive power. A clumsy theory was in-

vented by clumsy man; but as man himself, under the divine educative influence, becomes more spiritual, he instinctively discards the clumsy mechanism, instinctively falls into harmony with the divine spirit.

The Bible theory of inspiration is not of an external authority, but of influence, inbreathing. Man makes things by external measurements and means. God makes by inward growth. During our war men battered away at Charleston for four years, and only displaced a few stones. The mighty earth-force touched her for one quivering moment, and left destruction. Man makes a house noisily with saw and hammer. Silently God makes a tree. Man governs by courts and congresses. God writes his law unseen, upon the unseen heart. In human work man is always at the fore. He alone is God who hides *himself*. But inspiration man can not understand; he can only feel. He suns himself in the heavenly outflow, his whole nature expands with the heavenly inbreathing, but he can not define it.

When we have thoroughly read a volume of Homer or Ranke or Descartes we recognize that we have mastered its contents according to our several abilities. However wide its scope, still its scope is limited. We make no new discoveries in Macaulay. We found no new systems on Aristotle. These men do their work, shape the thought of their generation, and pass to the shelves of immortality —to be known by name to the intelligent, to be studied here and there by scholars, to be absolutely dead to the populace.

Thus also our best and latest books of religion—by Professor Allen, Matthew Arnold, Dean Stanley, Herbert Spencer, Professor Fisher, and others—full as they are of high thought and honorable words, enlightenment and sanctification, differ from the Bible in that they are not infinite. It is all there; nothing is behind. And it is

a little all—the arc of a small circle. But the Bible is forever unfolding. It is a growth and not a mechanism. It is a guide to the humble heart which knows nothing about it intellectually, but craves God. The wisest genius, conquering the mountain-tops of mind, finds equally that the Bible is before him, spanning still his highest heaven with its bow of promise, arched by his strictest law of mathematics, tinted according to his most rigid chromatic science, satisfying in form and color his most delicate artistic sense.

Other the best books are to the Bible what a picture of the midnight sky by some master's hand is to the dome of heaven itself. The picture is stirring, stimulating, suggestive, ideal; but it is a flat surface—always the same. Too near, it is a daub of oil on canvas. But the overbending heaven is ever-revealing. It charms the soul, it soothes grief, it gratifies the sense of beauty. It lights the peasant on his path, guides the mariner across the sea, who know not one star from another, except as private light and guide, nor guess whence any star is circling, or on what law it is hung. But the astronomer, too, who turns his cunning glass upon it, sees what they see, and more—marvels upon marvels, universe beyond universe, yet never gets so far as to reach a bound; with keenest eye and strongest lens never plucks its secret from the sky; with life-long study and devotion never takes a single step in learning that does not widen the horizon of his ignorance.

From such a book, the repository of the inspiration of ages, so heavily charged with the divine Spirit that we call it *The* Book of Inspiration, it is but natural to expect that truth upon truth will unfold. Its revelation should keep step with the march of the human mind. To found upon it an unchanging theology would be to relegate it to the list of books, great indeed, but plentiful

enough to make a list, accepted at one age of the world, practically unused thereafter. A theology unchangeably true to its unchanging principles of righteousness, love to God and love to man, but forever developing new features in conformity with new discoveries of its meaning after new study of its history and new unfolding of the secrets of the world—this is precisely what we should expect from that intensity of revelation which makes this the Book of books.

We are ever clamoring that God should be oracular, and he never is. Sometimes we try to make the Bible oracular by opening it at random and putting a blind finger on a verse. But this, also, is vanity. God is inexorable. He will not say to us yea or nay. All the authority of Scripture serves simply to give each man a warrant for his own convictions, a reason for the hope that is in him. He can intrench himself in error behind the breastwork of the Bible just as strongly to his own convictions as he can intrench himself in the truth. The light of revelation may shine in darkness, and the darkness comprehend it not. We have the revelation of Jesus the Christ. We have the revelation of the earth and the heavens; and we have within us that vital spark of heavenly flame, reason, which must be to each man his judge of all revelation. This reason we shrink from using. We are ever sinking down into the animal nature up from which we sprung, out from which we are bidden forth, and asking to be controlled, asking for an outside, tangible authority, for an "obvious authority, an imperial authority, an authority from which there is no appeal." But God has made us free agents and he requires that we control ourselves. He tells no one what to do, or think, or say, or believe; but within every man, differentiating him from the beast, making him in the image of God, is a something by which he must say, and do, and think

about all things for himself, both of this world and the next—the spirit of man and the law of God. All the way is strewn with blunders ; but so only is the right way learned. The inspiration of the Almighty giveth understanding, but not in any manner or to any extent that forbids the human understanding to be often at fault. Men make a thousand blunders even in their highest attempts at pure reasoning. All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, but discharging no man from responsibility for his own belief. For a thousand years it has said to no man : Do this ! Believe that ! The Bible is the deposit of ages of human experience under the unseen government of the universe. It marks and records the highest revelation of Deity to humanity. We trace in it the footsteps of the Creator from the first brooding darkness of our material universe to its culmination in the redemption of man through Jesus Christ our Lord. All that is contradictory in it, all that is unmeaning, is but the inevitable limitation of the human minds through which it was conveyed, of the human minds by which it is to be apprehended. It is just what Dr. Clark says it is not—God mirrored, but limited, in human conception ; but, with all our limitation, the divine element in the Bible is so strong, so sane, so overpowering, that—through all the errors of all the ages, through the bickering of churchmen, the ignorance of scholars, the mistakes of translators, the prejudices of commentators, through the besetment of bloody barbarism and barbarous intolerance—sweet and pure and clear it shines, with a steady and increasing light, justifying itself by its own radiance, slowly but surely softening the world with its warmth, transfusing ignorance with knowledge, penetrating manners with kindness, changing ferocity to gentleness, displacing selfishness by love ;

slowly, slowly, but surely, wresting—say, rather, releasing, redeeming, dissolving—this world from the dominion of the beast, and bringing us into the kingdom of our Lord, Christ, what we were originally created to be, the children of the Highest.

## CHAPTER XI.

### ONENESS WITH CHRIST.

Before approaching the subject of miracle it may be well to disembarrass ourselves of prejudice that the study or the results of the study are necessarily painful. He has little perception of the nature of truth who does not know that the world offers no greater joy than its discovery, whether that unfolding come slowly like the rapturous dawn, or suddenly, dazzling forth from clouds and thick darkness.

The agnostic, even the reverent agnostic, develops a robust capacity for believing that he who is dragged, rigid, resisting, anguished, at the chariot-wheels of thought, is the representative of a small minority of noble natures who are at the mercy of thought, at the mercy of truth, and from whom, in fact, all human advance comes. To such a one the parting with what is called the Christian mythology pictures itself as the rending asunder of bones and marrow. A recognition of the kinship of humanity with God and of the divinity of the order of nature represents itself as the soul-harrowing crisis of the intellectual and spiritual life.

Not so. A Christian of the old Christianity, who has not simply felt its spirit in his life but has given direct and candid thought to its doctrines, feels, in classifying its myth, that he has come to the fullness of time when the clumsy, centuries-gathered conglomeration is to fall

away and the simple, direct religion of Christ is to shine forth in its pristine purity. It is the sublime and crowning moment of his life, the revelation of God and from God in his own rapt and worshiping soul.

Eighteen hundred years ago Jesus Christ himself declared the truth of human and divine kinship; came on earth expressly to declare it; when he stretched forth his hand toward his disciples and said: "Behold my mother and my brethren! For whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven the same is my brother, and sister, and mother. As thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us."

Paul said it as strongly: "The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God, and if children then heirs; heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ." He not only asserted our sonship, but cried out, "*Because* ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his son into your hearts, crying Abba Father."

The beloved and loving disciple reiterated it: "Beloved now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be."

Old orthodoxy has befogged many truths, but it has kept itself alive because it has kept alive in its rugged bosom the vital truth that we are the children of God. It is a great truth, but it was not left for nineteenth-century agnosticism to discover.

"Every human soul in which the voice of God makes itself felt enjoys, equally with Jesus of Nazareth, the divine sonship."

This statement or formula, which has been presented as utterly subversive of the Christian religion, is in truth the very soul of the Christian religion.

It means something or it means nothing. The something meaning is that which lifts man to the level of

Christ. The nothing meaning is that which lowers Christ to the level of man.

Jesus Christ is only a great man: This is the final outcome of a long, sharp struggle in the devout agnostic who believes himself to be the slave of truth, and he immediately assumes toward Christ an attitude which, if Christ were indeed only a great man, would be simply maudlin. One of the rules of the Christian brotherhood, founded in London on a recoil from the Godhood of Christ, is that every meeting, every undertaking of whatever kind, shall open with the special word or formula of the brotherhood: "This do in remembrance of me."

Refusing to partake of the Communion Supper in remembrance of a risen Lord, they devise the eating of all meals in remembrance of a dead great man, and thus the brotherhood's carpenter rises in his cottage home, lifts his right hand, and pronounces solemnly: "The Master said, 'This do in remembrance of me,'" and the smallest youngster responds: "Jesus, we remember thee always."

It is little that this custom would rob the original rite of its special beauty and tenderness, or that it inevitably suggests to us Peter's crude and headlong desire to do something out of the common in first refusing to permit the Saviour to wash his feet with the others, and then insisting on being washed a great deal more than the others.

Nor is there objection to it on the old orthodox idea of Jesus, the Christ, if one finds in it a help to right living. It is futile and grotesque as an attempt to invest a mere Jewish peasant with the heavenly robes of a discarded divinity. The new religionist will have Jesus of Nazareth a mere man, but he can not leave him to take his chances beside other great men. We may admit the superiority of his character and of his intellect as a Jewish peasant; and I do not know any flaw in the integrity of Sir Moses

Montefiore or in the genius of Lord Beaconsfield, but the man who should attempt to induce people to say grace at table to Sir Moses Montefiore or to Mr. Disraeli would be counted a lunatic. We have as good men in our day and country as the world has ever seen, but no man ever spreads his hands over consecrated bread before the people and says, with reverent lips: "This do in remembrance of Lincoln." President Garfield never stood so low in the society of his time as stood Jesus in Judea, and never will be so high as Christ before Christendom, but no little children are taught to lisp at even-tide, "Garfield, we remember thee always." When the sermon is ended and the prayer offered, no congregation is ever dismissed with the benediction, "Go in peace, in the love of God, and in the memory of his servant George Washington." The very suggestion seems like mockery, irreverence. One feels a moral shock.

"God was in Christ not otherwise in kind than he is in man," says the devout agnostic, honestly believing that he feels the inward wrench of bones and marrow. Not at all. There is no marrow in such bones. This agonizing agnostic truth is a truism of the Bible. It is not only between Christ and man, but between God and man that there is no difference except in degree. We have the word of the Bible for all who believe the Bible. We have the word of science for all who reject the Bible. God made man in his own image, says the Genesis, and those who distrust the Pentateuch may read their Genesis out of Herbert Spencer:

"The power manifested throughout the universe distinguished as material is the same power which in ourselves wells up under the form of consciousness:

"The power which manifests itself in consciousness is but a differently conditioned form of the power which manifests itself beyond consciousness."

The Genesis of Moses and the Genesis of Science agree that the power which created man is the same in kind as man himself. It is a scientific confirmation of the Bible Genesis over which one might go mad with joy if one must go mad: and none more quickly than he who, reared in the old orthodoxy, accepting its truths, loving its spirit, emulating its self-training, yet can not adopt the traditions and impossibilities which have accumulated to its hiding. If it be not truth, it is yet to be explained how the earliest glimmer of light upon the nature of man should shine harmoniously with the latest gleam of the light which science has kindled. If it be not truth, it is certainly a wonderful cumulation to the proof of error that the oneness of humanity with divinity, vaguely and variously hinted at in many ways by many philosophers through many ages, apparently demonstrated by science in these later times, should conform so exactly with the Logos, the word incarnated in Christ, the unity of spirit outbreathed by him as life and immortality brought to light. His good tidings of great joy, communicated to his followers by the thousand-fold touch of personal association, and by them preached to the world through doctrine and enthusiasm and martyrdom, was that humanity partakes of the divine nature; that man alone of all created beings is in the image of God. He took not upon himself the form of beasts; he took upon himself the form of man, thereby consecrating and certifying humanity as the image of God.

But it is just as important to note the difference between God and man as it is to note the likeness; and to note that, although we are made in his image, we are a great deal more unlike him than we are like him. Strong in the consciousness of bearing his image, we at first reject this statement, but a second and reasoning thought compels us to accept it, because the quantitative difference

between God and man, though one of degree alone, is so great as to constitute a qualitative difference. An atom of salt spray on the rose's petal is in the image and likeness of the ocean. Its components and proportions are the same. It is governed by the same laws, is derived from the same source, is tending to the same goal, and the quantitative difference between itself and the ocean, though immense and to us incalculable, is not infinite. Yet who, from the evanescent and almost impalpable atom of spray, could form the slighest conception of the mighty deep, its boundless peace and eternal unrest, its marvel of color and sound and storm, its upbearing power, its purifying potency, its destructive energy, its ministration to human weal? Surely, the spray-atom, though of the ocean, is more unlike than like the ocean. It is like only by its own tiny measurement. It is unlike by the countless billows of the sea's wide-stretching solitudes.

The difference between God and man can not be estimated, but we can reach toward it. In the science and art of mechanism, man is a machinist. We understand that. God is also a machinist. Man makes a steam-engine, marvelously contrived, marvelously effective; but it never goes till it is started. Its fuel has each day to be clumsily put in, its water supplied, its track laid, its course guided every minute, without its own knowledge, or volition, or pleasure, or consciousness, by some one, by many, outside of itself. If it is left alone one moment, it either stands still idle or runs wild to destruction, while every valve and wheel and piston and crank is by itself a dead distinct thing, a useless piece of wood or metal.

The universe is the engine of God; its motive power invisible, its course inconceivably swift and silent along unerring paths, its life self-perpetuating, its sustenance self-administered, its Creator and engineer a God who always hideth *himself*; every minute subdivision of the

great machine, a separate machine, instinct with a life and purpose and pleasure of its own, and each one vitally bound to the great whole, rising at least in one case—man—into a machine instinct with the life of God!

The machine of the universe—as many stars, so many suns; as many suns, so many systems of worlds; and beyond all visible suns and systems, universe on universe circling the unthinkable spaces, till our great stirring, twinkling, twilight world is but a pin-point in the immeasurable sky—how can there be a being equal to framing, moving, guiding, upholding this visible universe, which is as far beyond thought as it is beyond expression?

There is only one thing to hold the mind steady; the universe is a fact. The miracle is wrought. The Christian and the atheist are at one on the main point—that the immensity exists, and that it is an immensity of order, law, harmony. Therefore it is of one. The anemone whorls its tender petals of earliest spring in obedience to the law which guides Arcturus with his sons. For all our littleness we are just as sure of this as if ourselves had made Arcturus and the anemone. The Christian and the atheist alike find themselves in a universe of law which they did not establish, and which they can not overthrow. It would, indeed, be impossible to believe that one being could create and control, from large to small, were it not that we see the creation and obey the control—both in infinite measure, great and small in both directions alike beyond our ken. What matter whether we call this creative force Absolute Being, or the Stream of Tendency, or the World-Soul, or Unconscious Intelligence, or the Unknowable, or Eternal Energy, or the Power outside ourselves that makes for righteousness—Jehovah, Jove, or Lord? All nomenclature is but the outreach of language toward the unreachable. All theology is but search for the unsearchable. What possible

analogy can give to a being chained every moment to one single spot of earth any adequate idea of a being who is at all times everywhere? Thought offers the only glimmer to the imagination, and that is, indeed, only a glimmer. What analogy between thought which can fix firmly on only one object at a time, and but feebly on two or three at most, and that Infinite Thought to which all is an Eternal Now and Here? Science is more frank than theology, and confesses an ignorance, an inability, which theology can not disown or disarm by calling it infidelity.

Nothing is gained for religion by attempting to include the greatness of God in the littleness of man. Here theology stumbles, but never demonstrates.

> "What mortals think they know of God
> A thousand tomes rehearse;
> What mortals do not know of God
> Fills all the universe."

*Nevertheless, the power which manifests itself throughout the universe is the same power which in ourselves wells up under the form of consciousness.*

"Beloved," says the apostle of love, "now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be; but this we know, that when we see him we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is." The argument of arguments for our hope in heaven lies in these words. Here we see God through mists and clouds—through a glass, darkly—through bad habits and low desires and false theology and all sorts of moral distortion and contortion and abortion, and we are only a little like him, only a little patient and true and just and kind, growing ever more and more, we trust, a little more like him; but there, when we see him as he is, the naturalness of his justice, the radiance of his goodness, will burn out the sin in us with its unquenchable fire, purify us to its own purity, kindle in us its own light and warmth. This is

what I read in the divine sonship of man, in the brotherhood of Christ, in our oneness with God.

The agnostic forgets this oneness of man with God, sees only Christ reduced to the level of man, when the oneness of humanity with Christ presents itself to him as a crucial point, an agonizing truth, the crisis of intense and even destructive spiritual struggle.

The trouble is that this sort of ideal truth-seeker is not at the mercy of truth or of thought, but of words. He does not think them out far enough or deep enough to see that a quantitative difference may, by reason of intensity and immensity, become a qualitative difference. God is in the beast, the same God that is in man, yet so differently in degree that the beast is classified popularly and practically as different in kind from man. We can not mark the boundary line, but we never fail to recognize it. Theoretically, it is elusive. Practically, it is insurmountable. Science amuses herself with detailing our oneness with the beast, but no Huxley makes a contract with his horse. John Bright never asked that sheep should have the ballot. Matthew Arnold did not urge an intermediate school for elephants. Schopenhauer and Schleiermacher and the most strenuous of the German evolutionists are at one with the most bigoted of pietists in treating talking animals as on an entirely different plane from dumb animals.

In and out of the Bible God speaks to us in terms of humanity as needs must, leaving thus to human reason wide scope for exercise, as also needs must. God is represented as our Father, Christ as our elder brother. In this world the son often becomes a greater man than the father. The younger brother often outstrips the elder in wisdom and stature, in favor with God and man. We do not on that account suppose ourselves to be greater than God. We need not on that account suppose ourselves to

be equal with Christ. What we may learn from it is that we partake of, we share in, the divine nature.

Radicalism itself has scarcely dethroned the divine Christ before it begins to reconstruct a human Christ on the old divine basis. Every step shows the difficulty of the task. When the new brotherhood founded without a divine Christ is assembled, the murmur of assent to the leader's oratory is so enthusiastic that he fears it is the personal element that is shaping their future and his, and he is up in arms lest any mere personal fancy should usurp the power and place of his idea.

Why should he deprecate personality? Personality was the strong point of the Jewish peasant whom he recognizes as master, yet who was but such a one as himself. Christ did not shrink from personality. Christ preached it, proclaimed it as head and front of his mission. "Come unto *me* all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.

"Take my yoke upon you and learn of *me*, for I am meek and lowly in heart—I am the way, the truth, and the life.

"Ye will not come unto *me* that ye might have life. I am the resurrection and the life.

"Ye that have followed *me*, every one that hath forsaken houses or brethren or sisters or father or mother or wife or children or lands for *my name's sake shall inherit eternal life.*"

Should we be willing to forego one jot or tittle of that divine self-setting-forth?

I believe and maintain that the world has never seen better men than those whom we know and honor, whom we love and live with; and if the difference between the best of them and Jesus Christ is not a quantitative difference which amounts to a qualitative difference, Jesus Christ was a very self-conceited man.

"Thou art the Christ, the son of the living God,' is the rock on which was built the Church of Christ.

"Jesus of Nazareth becomes to us by the evolution of circumstance the most moving, the most efficacious of all types and epitomes of God's work in man," is the rock on which the new church is founded. The statement is undoubtedly true as far as it goes, but is it so much more adequate and accurate a statement that a man should wreck his pastoral office and his personal happiness on its production? It is surely a far less fundamental utterance, a far more partial and local assertion than the one which it supplants.

"A new social bond, a new compelling force in man and in society," is what the agnostic craves; "that diminution of the self in man which is to enable the individual to see the world's ends clearly, and to care not only for his own but for his neighbor's interest; to make the rich devote themselves to the poor and the poor bear with the rich. If man only would, he could solve all the problems which oppress him. It is man's will which is eternally defective, eternally inadequate. Without religion you can not make the will equal to its tasks. Our present religion fails us; we must, we will have another."

With the roar of Jonathan Edwards still reverberating through New England theology, old England's agnosticism puts forth its pronunciamento on the eternal inadequacy of the will as a fresh discovery. With the voice of Christ ringing a thousand changes on the heavenly corrective, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," the voice of the agnostic clamors for a new compelling force in man and in society which shall make a man care not only for his own, but for his neighbor's interest. With thousands of churches and Young Men's Christian Associations and all sorts of societies of Christian Endeavor, the agnostic gathers another assembly as like as the peas

in a pod, and, because he calls his assembly "The New Brotherhood of Christ," he imagines that he is materializing a new religion. The agnostic's prayer at his first religious service of the new brotherhood is "rather an act of adoration and faith than a prayer properly so called. It represents, in fact, the placing of the soul in the presence of God. It is essentially modern, expressing the modern spirit, answering to modern need."

But before agnosticism was born the old-fashioned churches were singing:

"Prayer is the soul's sincere desire,
Uttered or unexpressed;
The motion of a hidden fire
That trembles in the breast.

"Prayer is the burden of a sigh,
The falling of a tear,
The upward glancing of an eye
When none but God is near."

The old religion fails us and we evolve a new religion out of our moral consciousness, and this new religion, upon examination, presents not one single person or purpose, principle or idea, which is not borrowed from the old, only so dismantled and degraded and betinseled as to seem almost a deliberate burlesque.

But it is not. Undoubtedly it is an honest and earnest attempt to find God; and it will succeed. And yet, speaketh Paul to-day, shew I unto you a more excellent way.

The agnostic turns away from the old religion, not because it has failed him, but because he has failed it. He is like one who got on comfortably enough with the system of things so long as the earth was the only world in the universe, but whose mind shrinks and shrivels before a universe of worlds. At the very moment when the grand sweep and scope of Christianity seems outlining

itself in the light of day, the light of heaven shining full upon our dark, revealing it to us as the heir of all the ages, the proof and promise of all our future, he reverses his field-glass and sees in Christianity only "something small and local."

Christianity something small and local! It is true or it is false according as it is set against Christ's words or against some untenable human dogma built upon Christ's words. If we must believe that the whole world was lost in sin without any effort on the part of its Creator to communicate himself to his children, to teach and guide and strengthen them, except through one wandering desert tribe leading to a Christ who benefits only those who consciously met him on earth, and those who now accept him through a certain definite formula—against such a theory the declaration that Christianity is something small and local is revolutionary. But he who has read the Bible with receptive and candid mind knows that all the books can not make Christianity much smaller, much more local than the grain of mustard-seed, the little leaven whereunto Christ likened it. But, small and local, the vital point was there, the eternal life which has been ever since unfolding, however slowly, which by its mighty development promises to become universal. The agnostic sees in that mustard-seed only a grain of sawdust.

## CHAPTER XII.

### MIRACLES.

"And miracles do not happen."

This is the culminating point of intellectual revolt and intellectual illumination in theology.

What is miracle? Is it a violation of the laws of nature? This may be or may have been the popular assumption, but in no science has more rapid and real advance been made than in theological science. Yet enlightened minds that pride themselves on being superior to popular superstition and above the domain of authority, will discuss theology exactly as if the theological world had been at a stand-still for a hundred years. There are men whose reputation for original research, for liberal views, for intellectual freedom, for eloquent theological revolutionism, rests chiefly on their skill in ridiculing discarded theories. Of the advanced positions of theology they exhibit a profound ignorance. Nay, more; so unequal are the ways of man toward theology that this very advance has been made its reproach. Theology, leaping from one stage to another as increasing light shows it the way, is represented as encountering defeat. Is astronomy defeated when men cease to counteract the evils of an eclipse with gongs, and begin to prophesy it by figures? Science does not drive theology from its positions. It clears the path and opens the gate by which theology rushes on radiant to new possessions and new triumphs. Rather is theology itself the ultimate science.

It would be a little further behind time, but no more really behind time, to write an essay to prove that the world is not sustained on the back of a turtle than it is to write an essay to demonstrate to theology that God does not violate his own laws.

With the wider and higher views that theology shares with and learns from all other sciences, theologians see that miracle is not the violation of law, but the action of law. Miracle is not even a deviation from known law. All apparent deviation is considered to be caused by the action of unknown law upon known law. Luther apprehended and illustrated this truth with equal clearness and beauty, divining it by the poetry of his own nature.

"I have recently witnessed two miracles," he wrote to his friend. "This is the first: As I was at my window, I saw the stars and the sky and that vast and magnificent firmament in which the Lord has placed them. I could nowhere discover the columns on which the Master has supported this immense vault, and yet the heavens did not fall.

"And here is the second: I beheld thick clouds hanging above us like a vast sea. I could neither perceive ground on which they reposed, nor cords by which they were suspended; and yet they did not fall upon us, but saluted us rapidly and fled away."

The wont of science is not to deny the apparent deviation, but to account for it. When Neptune wandered, the astronomers did not indolently content themselves with laying it to bad telescopes, or shimmering atmosphere, or deluded observers. They put up their lenses and discovered Uranus.

It is absolute truth that miracle lives with ignorance and is withered by knowledge; but, instead of establishing the impossibility of miracle, it establishes directly the contrary—its possibility; nay, even its probability. With

God alone the Omniscient is and can be no miracle. To him alone is no law unknown. To him is everything easy, open, natural. But man, limited and ignorant, is always liable to the operation of unknown laws—always liable to a miracle.

The course of modern thought is not, as many fear, to destroy the supernatural, but to lift nature into the region of what was formerly called the supernatural. We no longer look upon God as outside, showing himself occasionally by reversals of order. God is in his world. God is in his universe, showing himself always in the tranquil and stately march of universal order. The earth in its circling path has come, as it were, into a belt of miracle; the kernel of truth which lay at the heart of myth and legend has been brought under the reign of law, and miracle itself takes its place in the grand procession of knowledge, circling forever upward toward the eternal mystery.

And at this time of all times we are asked to reject the Bible as competent testimony; are referred to the "unbroken sequences of Nature, in the long history of man, for the revelation of God."

What does this revelation testify?

An exhaustive examination of human records on the theme of miracle requires, we are informed, a familiarity with several Oriental languages, including Sanskrit and Hebrew; fifteen years in the whole mass of existing records, Indian, Persian, Egyptian, Jewish; then fifteen years more for the Christian records from the beginning of the Christian era down to the sixth century, from Livy to Gregory of Tours, from Augustus to Justinian—thirty years of unbroken solitary labor.

And, after all is said, what does this revelation testify? "I find," says a student of such labors, "in the age which saw the birth of Christianity, as in so many

other ages, a universal preconception in favor of miracle —governing the work of *all* men of *all* schools. The air teems with miracles. The East is full of Messiahs!"

If there is any meaning to words, it would seem, then, that the revelation of God in the long history of man, outside the Bible, is a perfect confirmation and counterpart of the revelation of God in the New Testament. But no, quite the contrary, says the student.

Here is the syllogism.

God reveals his way in the long history of man.

The long history of man testifies to a universal preconception in favor of miracle, and the Bible testifies to the occurrence of miracle.

Therefore there are no miracles!

Or, to put it a little differently:

God reveals himself in human history. If thirty years of research into human record disclose a universal belief in and expectation of miracle, and if eighteen hundred years of experience reveal a belief in miracle accomplished, it is a proof that miracle is impossible. Such is the logic of agnosticism.

Then the revelation of God in the long history of man is a stupendous lie. Whatever may be the truth of the Bible, the revelation of God in the long history of man has been a delusion and a snare. It shows that humanity may have a *universal* preconception, with no truth to correspond; that these universal human instincts may be guided by culture and wrought into philosophy by *all* men of *all* schools, and yet signify nothing and come to nothing. The revelation of God in the long history of man is but a mockery if there is no such thing as miracle.

To say that miracles can not happen, which is the practical popular equivalent of the assertion that miracles do not happen, is to say that all the laws of nature and of

God are known to man. To say that miracles could not have attended the advent of Christ is to say that all the laws of all the universes were known to the Jews in Judea eighteen hundred years ago. All the laws of that matter which sparkles as stars in the heavens or which is hidden by unfathomable distance; all the laws which that inscrutable power called by science Force, by religion God, impresses upon matter; all the laws of that force, whether allied necessarily with matter, or working as pure force upon pure spirit—all are known to the one ephemeral being glued to one minute globe of the whirling universes. Man has encircled the cosmic sphere. What we do not know in this age, in this stage, in this world, can not be true.

Bigotry itself never took a narrower foothold. Science itself never made so preposterous a claim.

If not a single miracle had been recorded in the Bible, if no particle of testimony had ever been given in support of miracles, nothing can be true in the established constitution of things, but that miracles may happen. In the order of the universe there is a place for miracle, whether it ever happened or not.

If God was in Christ, reconciling the world to himself, the long history of man becomes logical. Everything is not explained, but everything is set in the line of explicability and tends toward a rational and lofty solution. If God was in Christ, the impossible becomes not only possible, but natural and orderly.

If God was in Christ, and if by him he made the worlds, Christ must have known all the possibilities and potencies of matter; he must have known the worlds he made. All that science has ever discovered, or will ever discover, he, the Maker, knew. Whatever force of service, of healing, was in plant or mineral, in simple or compound, Christ knew. Hidden from the world then,

hidden from the world now, Christ, if he made the world, knew it all. The constitution of light and heat and sound was familiar to him. Every source of disease, every mode of cure in the materia medica, every healing property in mind or matter, was familiar to him because they harmonized with the principles on which he had constructed the world. Science has hurried but slowly, creeping, fighting as she crept for right of way; yet, looking back, we see that she has made great strides, and they are all in the direction of the world of spirit. She has advanced always in the direction of lightening the clog of matter. From the clumsiness of wood and coal and iron she has released the refinements of oil and gas; for human labor she gives the machinery of unwearying iron fingers, conquering thus time and toil and space. The mocking and mysterious electricity, a sphinx subtile and dangerous, is not perhaps subdued, but mocks no longer; is very far from being even wholly understood, but is already trained to service, is compelled to submit to investigation; while the compelling mind has darted even beyond electricity and conjectured the elusive ether.

If God was in Christ to such an extent that by Christ he made the worlds, Christ must have known the worlds he made, in their ultimate constitution, in their remotest possibilities. If he sometimes used that knowledge in ways unknown to Judea, it was no miracle to *him*. It was no contravention of the laws of nature, but only an application of laws which the world had not yet discovered. If Jesus had chosen to flash his words from southern Judea to northern Galilee on the lightning's wing, it would have been a miracle. We flash our words around the earth and it is no miracle. Knowledge has withered the miracle. It is now but a natural process, a utilization of the earth's forces. But the same forces were in the earth then, lacking only the master mind to wield

them. If God was in Christ, the master mind was not lacking.

Without time to bring to the examination of every miracle, without the learning, or as yet the knowledge, to make such an examination conclusive, we may yet divide miracles into two classes, which may afford help to the judgment, and say : All miracles which lie along the lines of the world's movement have much in favor of their historical nature. All miracles which lie outside of that movement have no such probability, and by so much have a presumption on the side of their allegorical or mythical interpretation.

For example, the story of the talking serpent, the story of Balaam's ass, lie outside the track of the world's progress. There is no indication of the world's moving in the direction of conversational brutes ; that is, mind does not tend downward toward the intellectuality of animals. It is all the other way. It is toward the establishment of spirituality in man. It is away from animals to angels. I should therefore naturally consider the probability to be that these stories are allegorical, mythical, pictorial.

In confirmation of this view it may be observed that the miracles of Christ are generally, if slightly, attached to nature. Sometimes it is only the will of man that is concerned. Often the miracle is built up, as it were, on the material world—is, we may say, but a step beyond our reach. If we take, for example, the first miracle which Jesus wrought in Cana of Galilee, we see that he did not create wine out of nothing. He turned water into wine. The miracle, instead of being inconceivable, is conceivably credible and scientific. Let me not be misunderstood. I give it simply by way of illustration and suggestion, not by way of proof. Nor is the illustration or the science mine—only the application.

Water, composed of oxygen and hydrogen, lacks in chemical combination one of the elements needed by molecular change to form wine; but it *does hold in solution* the lacking element—carbon. Water, at ordinary temperatures and atmospheric pressure, is capable of holding an equal volume of carbon dioxide, which may be absorbed from the atmosphere; and as that supplies carbon, it is possible to have in water every element needed to form wine—namely, oxygen, hydrogen, carbon. The sugar is made up wholly of molecules of water combined with carbon. The ethers and the acids are formed of groupings of the same elements. The alcohol results from slight molecular changes in the sugar. If, then, we had the power of controlling molecular changes in water, we no doubt could at any moment transmute it into wine. Nature continually does this. Every opening spring and summer and autumn sees the unwearied sun from day to day turning water into wine. It needed but an intensifying of the force of nature to accomplish the miracle—an intensification and an accomplishment which we may all one day command.

With our present knowledge of chemistry we have no such control. But neither had Luke any knowledge of the trained possibilities of steam. To Zebedee the electric car would have been as impossible as to us molecular disturbance. Two weeks before the ocean cable was firmly laid, science printed elaborate and incontrovertible arguments showing that the constitution of water must forbid the transmission of electricity for any long distance. Christ never pretended any miracle more absurd to all but the credulous than to hear a man talking a hundred miles away. We have not raised the dead, but we have already invented an instrument by which one, although dead, yet speaketh, and may speak for a thousand years.

Is it incredible, inconceivable, that the power, the force, the God who or which stamped atoms with the laws we know, may have stamped upon them also other laws which we have not yet discovered? Shall a world which has learned, one might almost say, to live by water; which within a few years has learned how to produce motion and light and heat from water; how to force water into its service to do its hardest work; how to make air and lightning its spiritual messengers and annihilate space and time in common talk—is it for such a world to say that an accelerated transmutation of water into wine is inconceivable and unscientific?

If God was in Christ, the thing is not only possible but natural. Christ himself always treated his miracles as natural, referred to them sometimes as proof of his power, but quite as often apparently sought to lighten the stress laid upon them; often indeed adjured his followers not to mention them, not to speak of them. It was as if he would occasionally appeal to things palpably and strikingly beyond their knowledge to impress upon them that he was master of knowledge; but at the same time he was alert that they should not rest there, should not fritter themselves away in vain wondering about matters otherwise unimportant, beyond the scope of that day, but should use the confidence imparted by his superior knowledge, in the absorption of those spiritual truths which he had come to enforce by the authority, the illumination, the power of his divine personality.

If God was in Christ, if Christ was God manifest in the flesh, miracles were not only conceivable, but natural, orderly, to be expected from him. It all depends upon the fact and truth of the incarnation; it is whether Jesus Christ was at the head of the list of Socrates, Cato, Lorenzo, Howard, Franklin, and Mr. Bergh; or whether he was the Son of the Living God.

The fact of the incarnation is not affected by any philosophy of the incarnation.

If Jesus Christ had descended from Joseph and Mary by ordinary generation, it would have no relation whatever to the truth of the incarnation.

If it had been left to us to devise a mode of incarnation, there could occur to us no reason why the extraordinary divine should not invest itself with the orderly and ordinary divine humanity. There would indeed seem to be a reason why it *should*, for thus would the incarnate be in *all* points like as we are, only without sin.

The fact of the resurrection is not affected by any philosophy of the resurrection.

If in some tomb, hewn out of the solid rock, there should be discovered to-day the unquestionable body of our Lord, wound in the linen clothes, with the hundred-pound-weight of myrrh and aloes wherewith loving friends had laid it to rest—none the less, Christ the Lord is risen to-day.

Humanity has no experience out of which to evolve any theory of a new order. Nothing can be more narrow than to limit the ways, the modes by which God shall enter his world, by which spirit force shall impress itself upon matter, by which the ever-immanent shall reveal itself to the finite. We have not to invent ways in which power would be likely to manifest itself. We have only to study the ways in which power has manifested itself. We are to study the incarnation as we find it in the unbroken sequences of nature, in the long history of man ; as the old Andover founders put it, through that infallible revelation which God constantly makes of himself in his works of creation, providence, and redemption.

The grounds of Christianity are literary and historical. They are also philosophical. If they were not philo-

sophical, their literary and historical character would be insignificant.

For the present, however, let us consider Christianity on its literary and historical grounds; on which ground Christian story is, by certain scholars, decided to be false. "To the man who has had the special training required, and in whom this training has not been neutralized by any overwhelming bias of temperament, the Christian story is *proved* false; is *demonstrated* to rest on a tissue of mistake."

What is the special training required to prove the Christian story false? In one case we have seen that it is a knowledge of Hebrew, Sanskrit, and other Oriental languages and thirty years' research into the records of India, Persia, Egypt, Judea, and the Christian records for the first six centuries of the Christian era. It will readily be seen that a *demonstration* of the mistake of the Christian story is inaccessible to the great mass of humanity. We must take the falsity of the Christian story on faith, and on a good deal more faith than the Christian story requires. I venture to say there are not a hundred men in America, I question if there are a hundred men in England, who have devoted the thirty years of research necessary to this demonstration; while there are hundreds of men—there have been perhaps hundreds of thousands of men—who have devoted life to the investigation and elucidation of the Christian story. The Christian story is spread before our eyes. No man so poor but he can buy the documents and read and judge for himself. The falsity of Christianity is demonstrated by documents which the vast majority of the human race, which the vast majority of Christendom, never have seen, never will see, never can see. All the documents that prove Christianity false have not been able to secure from the master races of the world one thousandth part of the

scrutiny which has been lavished on the story of Christianity.

A few, a very few, years ago a little book was discovered, a mere treatise of two thousand one hundred and ninety words; and because it related to the first century after Christ the learned world sprang upon it with an eagerness that has produced a library of comment. Already it is said the literature of that one little book—what it teaches, what it confirms, the light it throws on dark places—has occupied the most original, the best furnished minds of the age. So far from there being any decline of interest or any decline of confidence even, in this cool, critical, unsuperstitious, evidence-weighing nineteenth century, the literature of this late-found leaflet already exceeds that on any of the so-called Apostolic Fathers. And it all tends to confirm the truth of the Christian story!

Considering Christianity as a question of documents, outside of itself what documents are in its favor? For one thing, everything. Every book from the printing press, every newspaper at the breakfast table, every bill sent from the grocery, every bequest from the dead, every contract of the living, bears witness to the truth of the Christian story. All the letters of affection, all the telegrams of business, all the exact details of legal transaction, are founded on the truth of Christ, and by their very date testify of his coming—Anno Domini—the Year of our Lord. Nearly two thousand years ago *something happened* in the East—something which happened without observation, but which had persistence and pervasiveness, which insinuated itself into the very framework of society till out of silence and suffering and shame it has changed the heart and the face of civilization and has become the dominant idea of the dominant race of the world. Every man who reads or heeds December

25, 1888, January 1, 1889, July 18, 1890, confesses Christ, be he saint or sinner, Jew or Gentile, infidel or rector, tractarian or radical.

The whole structure of the dominant civilization is not only based on but inwrought with the truth of the Christian story. If by any means the name and the story of Jesus Christ, everything which has come from it into the life of the world; could suddenly and completely be burned out of the memory and consciousness and record of man, society would be a chaos.

"The toiler of the world," says the doubter, sadly, "as he matures, may be made to love Socrates, or Buddha, or Marcus Aurelius. It would seem often as though he could not be made to love Jesus."

By their fruits ye shall know them. Which has the most influence on life to-day in Europe and America, Socrates, or Buddha, or Marcus Aurelius, or Jesus Christ? How many churches are reared to Buddha in England? How many working men and women on the continent sustain a memorial supper to Socrates? How many of the trades unions of the United States or how many individual members of society, young men and maidens, ever founded an alliance of mutual endeavor in right living, in beneficent and charitable work, in the name of Marcus Aurelius? Or of Socrates? Or of Buddha?

A little while ago a young girl—sweet, pure, perfect, I think one might say—went beyond the vision of earth. Three and a half years after her death a sealed envelope was found which contained a paper whose date showed that it was written when she was twelve years old. It was to this effect:

"I do henceforth and forever give myself to the Lord Jesus Christ. I give my soul to him; my body to work for him; my tongue to speak for him; my hands to

work for him. I give my whole self to him, to be forever his. He will keep me, guide me, and guard me. I must seek him every day. I must love him better than all the rest of the world. I must do as I know he wants me to do, and all I do must be to please him. I must love to read his word. I must do all the good I can in all the ways I can. Not one of all these things can I do without his help, and he will help me if I come to him with my whole heart."

Seven years after, overtaken by sudden illness in Europe, the same little hand wrote :

"Oh, my darling, how I miss you ! I am so homesick that I feel sometimes as if I can not bear it.

"Nothing seems like home. When I think I may die here, the longing is dreadful to get home and see you all once more. I would give all Europe to be with you again. But Jesus is my never-failing friend. He is *always* near with comfort and help. He always makes me happy and *satisfied* to leave every event of life or death in his hands."

Is it only what Jesus Christ has in common with Marcus Aurelius, and Socrates, and with other Jewish peasants of amiable inclinations that brings him thus in effective pledge and stimulus, comfort and succor, to the innocent—yes, and to the guilty, to the weak, the struggling, to the helpless and the suffering ? What lie is more stupendous than God's revelation of himself in the long history of man if the Christian story which has ministered to generations of trusting, helpless, ignorant, devout, shall in a moment of dread awakening, or a more dreadful blank and dark, be proved false ?

"*To reconceive the Christ.* It is the special task of our age, though in some sort and degree it has been the ever-recurring task of Europe since the beginning."

Why ? There has never been anything which might be

called a movement toward reconceiving Socrates, or Marcus Aurelius, or George Washington. We have not been aware of any especial attempt in Europe or America to reconceive Buddha, though Buddha is for us originally and as a man no more an Oriental, an Asiatic, than is Jesus Christ. And Buddha had anywhere from five to fifteen hundred years the start of the Christ. Why is it that the world can never have done with Jesus Christ? Why is it that he, his name, his nature, his life, his character, his work, is the center of perpetual interest, is the pivot upon which the world's life turns to-day?

We can not all spend thirty years among Persian manuscripts and past ages, but a present European and American fact must be met. It can not be buried under any mass of legendary or Oriental lore. We require no learning to see that the stamp of Christ is on Christendom and that the stamp of Christendom is on the world. A Jewish peasant? Believe it who must. It is better to believe so much than not to see Christ at all. It is better to touch the hem of his beautiful garments than not to recognize in any way his benign and beneficent presence. But to me that belief is but the substitution of an unmeaning, unreasonable, and degrading miracle for a philosophical, an ennobling, and significant miracle. It sets a miracle, at odds with the long history of man, in the place of a miracle wholly in line with the history of man.

To me it is easier to understand it, if in him was *life;* and that life is the light of men; to believe that in him the Word, the Logos, the Eternal Reason was made flesh and dwelt among men; and forever as long as the world stands, and more and more closely and lovingly the longer the world stands, will men study that object-lesson from the unseen universe, will men peer through that rift in the heavy clouds of matter to discern life and immortali-

ty brought to light; good tidings of great joy which shall be to all people.

That the air teems with Messiahs is the testimony of the documents. Who stamped upon humanity this divine expectation, wholly at variance with the unbroken sequences of nature? Whence came this idea of heavenly transmission, this instinct of the Holy Ghost, this aspiration for a higher order to crown the world's completion?

For hundreds of years before Christ came, in what wide regions remote we find this hope, this aspiration, a presentiment of humanity in the direction of help from above, a more than mortal power to spring from earth's highest virgin purity vitalized from the unseen universe.

If the revelation of God in the long history of man is trustworthy, must there not be some essential truth to meet this wide expectation?

Science scoffs the possibility. Does science never hint the possibility? *Are* the sequences of nature unbroken? Science has spoken some significant words; not less significant because they were not spoken to this point.

It is a common scientific statement that the laws governing the higher forms of life can be rightly comprehended only by an acquaintance with the lower and more formative types of being. Science is continually making more and more evident the close relations which exist between our own life and the lives of the very humblest of our fellow-creatures—even those minute creatures whose organisms consist of a single cell.

In no problem is this more true than that of sex. It is not until we go below the vertebrate series and contemplate the invertebrate and vegetable worlds that we really begin to find the data for a philosophical study of the meaning of sex.

This is the impartial major premise of Science. Since we can not then complete a philosophical cycle of the

highest life until we learn the lowest, what does that investigation teach for a minor premise ?

That there is a great world of life which wholly antedates the appearance of sex, the world of asexual life ; but, so far as sex can be predicated of this world of asexual life, it is feminine. The genesis is parthenogenesis. The parthenogenetic parent is in all essential respects a mother. There are numberless cases in which the female form constitutes the type of life.

It follows then—it is still Science speaking, not I—that the argument from biology that the existing relations between the sexes in the human race are perfect and permanent, comprise all that Nature ever intended and have no further significance, leads logically to absurdity. Those who rightly interpret the facts can not avoid learning that the female sex is primary, in point both of origin and of importance, in the history and economy of organic life. And as life is the highest product of Nature, and human life the highest type of life, it follows that the grandest fact in nature is woman ; that woman is the race !

Evolution has no limits. If these principles, laid down by science, are correct, in the far-away ages of the lowest forms of life, in the first introduction of life upon this planet, may be discerned the signs of the coming of the Son of Man, born of the Virgin Mary. The sequences of nature, so far from disproving the Christ, foreshadow him. The sequences of nature are broken to testify of him. Far off his coming shines.

In the same spirit of scientific humility and spiritual discernment we should regard the statement of the resurrection and ascension of our Lord. Through life he is represented like as we are, and there is visible and palpable no reason why his assumption and dismissal as well as his conduct of life should not be those of humanity.

The resurrection of the body for ourselves we have utterly discarded. Why should it not be discarded for the body of Christ? If flesh and blood can not inherit the kingdom of God, how can we declare, with the Thirty-nine Articles, that when Christ did truly rise again he took with him into heaven his body, flesh, and bones, and all things appertaining therewith?

The disciples had no thought, apparently, of natural history, and by the resurrection they meant nothing but palpable continuance of life. In some way, by incontestable evidence, they were shown that he was not dead, but alive for evermore. The spiritual body we have not so much as begun to analyze—or even to certify its existence—any more than had the apostles. Whether they saw Christ after his resurrection in the spiritual body, by what unknown laws he may have manifested himself to them, one thing is assured: they were certain that they had seen the Lord; their conviction that Christ had risen, and that he is Christ the Lord, sprang up so strong and firm out of the grave, where their hope was buried with him, that it has conquered the world.

It may well be that this vital fact clothed itself with a defective reason and philosophy of which clearer reason and a truer philosophy will divest it; but we should do well to remember that the impossibilities of our reason and our philosophy may be the natural order of the future, and that the babes and sucklings of metaphysics, holding firm to the living fact that underlies all reason and all philosophy, may be nearer the kingdom of God, the kingdom of truth, the kingdom of science, even, than the hoariest veterans of reason who reverence only reason; and that their own. With the widest spiritual freedom, with the greatest scientific liberty, no grace is more compatible and more comely than spiritual and scientific humility!

The mystery of Christ's incarnation is no greater than the mystery of every incarnation; both are absolutely inscrutable. Science confesses herself no nearer the solution of the problem to-day than she was at the beginning of time. But the one is in the order of nature we say.

How long an order? How wide a nature? A point of time, a moment's space. For we see that even in this one little world of yesterday the sequences are not unbroken. Even here Nature herself points to a diviner plan.

If the Immanent had chosen to reveal himself through the common ways, it would have been none the less a revelation. Is it less a revelation if from the first throes of life to this nineteenth century, eyes that can see, nay, read the signs of a higher order, may see in the incarnation what the protoplasm meant; may read the mystery of redemption in the riddle of the parthenogenetic Sphinx; may discern along this one shining pathway how the unknown and invisible universe has come down with its own divine order to touch our lower order with the breath of its higher life?

It is not breadth or culture or science, but a lack of all, which says that the order of yesterday, the order of to-day is the eternal order; that the order of here and the order of there is the universal order. But now that Science herself confesses that the order of here is not the order of there, that the order of now is not the order of then, this argument should disappear forever from the haunts of logic.

From what we know of the long history of man, from the myths of the early ages to the news of the morning paper, from the Messiah of the Old Testament and the Christ of the New Testament emerging slowly out of shadow, ruling to-day in the heart and at the head of the world, I gather that when the fullness of time was come, when the orderly evolution of life had reached the

destined stage,—the absolute energy, the Almighty God which had already at some previous unknown stage breathed into man and man alone the breath of divine life, imparted now to the divine life in man a new energy, advanced him by a fresh afflatus of the eternal love to loftier spiritual heights. Humanity, which had been already forever differentiated from the beast by the breath of a distinct life, received now the highest seal of its consecration to Spirit by the *manifestation* of God in the flesh.

The incarnation of God in Christ was no more a miracle than was the incarnation of God in man ; the individualizing of absolute force in limited personality. It was the same kind of miracle operating at a higher stage of evolution. Of the constitution of spirit we are utterly ignorant. Of the alliance between spirit and matter we know but the alphabet. We live on the shores of the spiritual ocean. Its invigorating breath is on our brows. Its surge sweeps at our feet. Its murmur, inarticulate but inspiring, is in our ears. All that life has of worth or joy or hope is wafted to us in the breath of that unfathomable sea. But whither it bears us we can not know till we embark on its mysterious tide.

Foolish, false, trivial rumors of miracles no more invalidate miracle than false and foolish men forbid the dignity of humanity. Documents have their worth ; but the existence of man upon the earth is not a matter of documents, and the existence of the earth prior to the advent of man upon it is not a matter of documents. Yet at some time between the two came a miracle. Whether it came suddenly in full measure or subtly without palpable measure matters not. There was a moment when human reason did not people the earth. There was another moment when human reason was astir. At the moment between when human reason came there was a miracle.

Something was here that was not here before. A new wave of the absolute force never refluent overspread the earth.

Such another wave from the eternal energy, which is also—science teaches it—eternal love—swept over the world so powerfully in Christ that it stands once for all in the long history of man as the Advent. A wave never spent, for when the humanity of Christ ceased in visible form, as must be if God were to assume humanity, a Holy Spirit remained, a vital power,—remains to-day, diffused, prevailing; independent of church or state or school or creed, though using all for the behoof of men; the largest insweep from the spiritual world this world has ever known; slowly evolving out of the beastliness of humanity, in eternal order, its eternal life.

THE END.

Princeton Theological Seminary Libraries
1 1012 01246 8916